

English

MODERN PHILOLOGY

VOLUME XXXV

August 1937

NUMBER 1

THE *DÁMUSTA* SAGA AND FRENCH ROMANCE

MARGARET SCHLAUCH

I

AMONG the more fantastic of the late Icelandic sagas which are so aptly termed *lygisögur* ('lying tales') by the natives, none presents a stranger combination of incredible incidents than the *Dámusta saga Spekinga í Grikklandi*. Like so many others of the type, it shows a marked inclination toward the use of magic and the supernatural; the ordinary human feelings and simple, credible events, so admirably and memorably portrayed in the earlier Icelandic literature, are remote from it. Because of its preference for the fantastic and unreal, it (in common with others of its type) has received little attention from students of Icelandic literature; but it is precisely the supernatural element in it which gives it significance for the study of comparative literature and folk lore, despite its obvious literary weakness.

The story of this quaint saga runs as follows:¹

King Katalactus of Greece has a fair daughter Gratfana, who is instructed in all languages. She refuses every suitor. The king keeps a group of twelve councilors or *spekingar*, one of whom has a son, Dámusti. The boy is reared with the princess, and evinces especial devotion to the Virgin Mary, whose hours he reads faithfully.

King Jón of Suðrland (also called Smálandsrík) lands at Constantinople on his way to Russia from the north and woos the princess. Surprisingly

¹ Summarized from MS Kall 613, fols. 122b-137b in the Royal Library, Copenhagen. The manuscript is paper and is dated by the scribe at the end: "Endat ad Söndum í Míðfirðe þann 30 Januári Anno 1751." This is, of course, no indication of the date of composition.

enough, she consents, "& Var hun þá rauð sem Rósa." She and Jón are betrothed; but Dámusti, pained at this turn of events, asks permission to leave court, together with his three treasures—a remarkable horse, hound, and hawk. When Jón is returning to Constantinople for the marriage, Dámusti lies in ambush and kills him with all his men. Then he goes directly to the palace and reports the deed, offering the king "self-doom." The king, however, manifests unusual restraint. He does nothing at all about the incident, though he mildly expresses his regret for it.

Soon after this, the princess sickens, dies, and is buried in a vault. Dámusti is so distressed that he can neither eat nor sleep, since it is now clear that his murder was done in vain. As a result of his prayers, the Virgin appears to him in a dream and informs him that he has won her intercession because he had read her hours so faithfully. He is ordered to rise forthwith and seek his lady's grave with his horse, hawk, and hound, for she needs his help.

In the churchyard Dámusti sees a huge mounted champion ride in, accompanied by a large dog. The stranger begins to disinter Gratiana with his bare hands. When Dámusti challenges him, he replies: "My name is Alheimr, and now thou shalt see what I will. I shall now visit the Princess, since I intended her for myself and for no other man, and I shall enjoy her dead because I could not when she was living." Dámusti protests vehemently and offers combat to the monstrous intruder. During a lull in the fight the latter explains that he comes from another world; after a second intermission, in which Dámusti has prayed, the latter hews off one of Alheimr's hands, but Alheimr imperturbably rejoins it to the stump. (This was only possible because he caught it before it fell and touched the earth.) Meantime Dámusti's horse and hound have killed those belonging to Alheimr, who decides to yield. He confesses that he had put the evil thoughts into Dámusti's head and helped him to ambush King Jón, but the Virgin has spoiled his plans. The princess is not really dead, he explains; if Dámusti will take her home and remove the leek beneath her tongue she will be restored to life. Dámusti is then to recount everything before her father at the Thing, using the dead horse and hound as evidence. He must give thanks to his God, too. With this valuable advice, Alheimr departs. "Go where all trolls may keep you," cries Dámusti after him, rather ungratefully (*Far þu þangað, sem þig hafa öll Tröll*!).

Gratiana is restored to life and she consents to marry Dámusti because of his victory, and God's mercy on him. He rules over Greece after the death of King Katalactus.

This edifying plot has been briefly commented upon by Finnur Jónsson.² He mentions chiefly the strong religious element in the

² *Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litteraturs Historie* (Copenhagen, 1902), III, 59-60. Eugen Kölbing, "Über isländische Bearbeitung fremder Stoffe," *Germania*, XVII (1872), 195, confesses that he has been unable to find any source for the saga.

story, as it appears in both the saga and the later *rímur*. His summary is based on the *rímur*, not the saga, although in his edition of the *Dámusta rímur*³ he admits that the saga is the original version and that the poems are based on it. Because he did not go to the saga for the plot, he omits some of the most significant features: the description of Alheimr, the incident of the hand cut off and restored, the cause of Gratiána's apparent death, and the mode of resuscitating her. Nevertheless, he did point out a contemporary Icelandic folk tale (*Af Jóni Upplandakóngi*), which, as we shall see, resembles the saga in a number of ways.

The theological coloring given to the tale is unusual for a saga even in the later Middle Ages. Dámusti is the only Icelandic hero I recall who alternates devotions to the Virgin with combats in the field. The fact that he does so is, of course, an indication that the narrator of his exploits was a cleric, familiar with collections of miracles of the Virgin. The disputation between Alheimr and Dámusti on matters spiritual during an intermission in their fight, brief as it is, recalls another type of literature, the *chansons de geste*, in which a Christian knight and a gigantic Saracen champion occasionally divert themselves in similar manner by a scholastic discussion of the mysteries of the Christian religion before they return to an exchange of blows. The classic instance of such a disputation is to be found in the chronicle of "Turpin" under the heading: "De bello Ferracuti gigantis et de obtima disputatione Rotolandi."⁴ Here the literal-minded Ferracutus confesses that he is unable to grasp the mysteries of the Trinity, virgin birth, and resurrection, despite the analogies from nature helpfully supplied by Rotolandus; it is with genuine relief, one imagines, that he suggests a return to physical combat in order to settle the question of superiority in religion.⁵ A similar argument ap-

³ *Rimasafn*, "Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur," No. 35 (Copenhagen, 1921), p. 771: "Rímerne beror paa en saga, der haves."

⁴ *Turpini historia Karoli Magni*, ed. Ferdinand Castets (Montpellier, 1880), pp. 30 ff.; also *Codez quartus Sancti Iacobi de expedito et conversione Yspanie et Gallicie editus a Beato Turpino archiepiscopo* (privately printed by Ward Thoron, 1924), chap. xvii.

⁵ It is interesting to notice that one of Roland's arguments turns up in another Icelandic saga, derived from a different source and used in a different setting. Explaining the Trinity, Roland says in the *Turpin chronicle*: "In sole tria sunt, candor, splendor et calor, et tamen unus sol est." In the *Eireks saga Viðförla*, the hero, not yet converted, is entertained by the emperor of Constantinople and receives from him instruction in the Christian religion. The emperor explains the Trinity thus: "Littu í sólina; í henni eru þrjár greinir, eldr, birtí ok vermir ok er þó ein sól; svá er ok í guði fadir ok son ok hellagr andi, ok þó

pears in *L'entrée d'Espagne*,⁶ and there are other combats diversified by disputes in the *chansons de geste*. The prayer offered by the hero in the midst of the combat is also a commonplace in this type of Old French literature.⁷

The *Dámusta saga* differs from the *chansons de geste* in that it changes the roles of the two combatants. Here the Christian hero receives more instruction than he gives, and his mentor is a non-Christian demonic adversary with necrophilous tendencies! Dámusti asks Álheimr about his abode and receives this answer:

"I do not dwell in the same world as you, but there are more worlds than this alone, and mankind is so great that all of it cannot dwell in this."—"Art thou not a man?" asks Dámusti. "I am a man indeed," says Álheimr, "and shaped like one."—"Dost thou know who created man?" asks Dámusti."—"I know of a surety," says Álheimr, "that God has created man and all else in the world, but I do not have a nature meet to serve Him."

Later Dámusti inquires again about the monster's home, and receives another question in reply: "Why dost thou constantly ask this, which I shall not tell thee?" He suggests a useful question which would also be answerable: an inquiry "about thy destiny and the course of thy life!" To this Dámusti replies "Never!" With unimpaired good humor, the demon nevertheless gives him the good advice about reviving Grátfana and giving thanks to God.

In spite of the moral and theological elements so conspicuous in the saga, the central theme is clearly the false death brought about by a demon lover and followed by resuscitation. A plot of this sort is not necessarily Christian; it would be harmonious with the folk lore of many peoples.

Finnur Jónsson called attention to the existence of an Icelandic folk tale of our own times which preserves a striking similarity to the saga despite its excessive brevity and omissions:⁸

einn í sínum almeðti" (*Fornaðgur Norðrlanda*, ed. Valdimar Ásmundarson, III, 518). This passage is based on one in the *Elucidarius* attributed to Honorius of Autun (see M. Schlauch, *Romance in Iceland* [New York, 1934], pp. 49 f.).

⁶ Ed. Antoine Thomas (Paris, 1913), I, 136 (ll. 3689 ff.).

⁷ In *Fierabras*, ed. A. Kroeber and G. Servois (Paris, 1860), the combat of Oliver and Fierabras is diversified by recriminations (rather than arguments) on the subject of religion. In the Middle English *Otuel*, the hero, himself a converted heathen, gives Clarel a summary of the articles of faith before fighting him and killing him (*Firumbras and Otuel and Roland*, ed. Mary Isabelle O'Sullivan ["E.E.T.S.," orig. ser. 198 (1935)], pp. 96 ff.). Cf. also *La Chevalerie Ogier de Danmarche*, ed. J. Barrois (Paris, 1842), I, 57.

⁸ Jón Árnason, *Íslenskar þjóðsögur og æfintýri* (Leipzig, 1862), I, 284 f.

In the time of King Ólafr Haraldsson of Norway there lives a king of the Uplands named Jón, renowned for his radiant golden hair. He woos and is betrothed to a rich damsel; but while he is absent at home preparing for the marriage, she falls ill and dies. Jón reaches her town in ignorance of her death. He arrives late and chances to enter the graveyard. He notices a new-made grave, but still does not know whose it is.

Now he sees a large and tall man riding in at the gate, girt with a sword, and carrying a hawk on his hand, and a hound ran ever before him. When he saw that a man was present inside, he retreated twice. The third time he ran up to the gate, King Jón addressed him and asked him his name. He said he was called Alheimr. "What is thine errand?" asks King Jón. "I have a due errand here," replies Alheimr; "I intend to visit my sweetheart." It is only now that Jón learns who is buried in the new grave. Alheimr confesses that he brought about her seeming illness and death, "for I wished no man to enjoy her but myself." Jón fights him, and in defending himself kills Alheimr's horse, hound, and hawk, and strikes off Alheimr's hand. "I need both my hands in the place where I live!" remarks Alheimr cryptically, and speaks a verse before he departs:

'Hestr er lestr, haukr er
dauðr
hundr er sviptur lífi
gengr drengur or garði
snauðr
gott hlaut ekki af vífi.'

The horse is lamed, the hawk
is killed,
The hound has lost his life,
Poor goes the champion
out of the yard:
No good has come from this wife.

Jón now digs up the body of his sweetheart and discovers that she is alive after all.

This tale shows indebtedness to the fable of our saga and the *rímur*. The verse quoted in it is, in fact, taken directly from the *rímur*. On the other hand, both beginning and end are missing; the tale omits the character of Dámusti entirely and the Christian elements associated with him. Konrad Maurer surmises⁹ that the tale is probably incompletely recorded. This is the more likely since the version given by Jón Árnason, as told by Særa Eyjólf á Völlum í Svarfaðardal, is entitled "Inntak úr söguþætti," or *summary* of a saga; and it is followed by a note of the narrator to the effect that he had written it down from a memory preserved since childhood. He had heard several women tell it, he says, including his grandmother. She knew this *þáttur* (section of a saga) in full, "and had taken it in proper saga speech (*i réttu sagamáli*) from old calfskin books." Moreover, she was learned in sagas, *rímur*, genealogies, and fables, "and had heard

⁹ *Isländische Volkssagen der Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1860), p. 321.

most sagas, both native and foreign, as they were found here in this country written in Norse." There are several indications, then, that a written saga was the source of this folk tale. It may have been something close to the *Dámusta saga*, notwithstanding differences and omissions, since there are verbal parallelisms.¹⁰ In any event, there is some sort of genetic connection, though the precise nature of the intermediate form is not clear.

II

The *Dámusta saga* belongs to a literary type, the *lygisögur*, which was notoriously dependent upon foreign sources and models. The closest parallel to it which I have been able to find is in the French romance of *Amadas et Ydoine*, composed, according to its most recent editor, in the early part of the thirteenth century.¹¹ The latter part of this romance contains an episode of simulated death, burial, combat in a graveyard with a demon lover, and resuscitation, which is close enough to have yielded the saga writer all he needed for his plot. Since *Amadas et Ydoine* was evidently first composed in the Anglo-Norman dialect, it would seem likely that the form known in Iceland was, like so many other romances, derived from England rather than directly from France. Such a situation is not surprising, in the light of the general literary relations presented by H. G. Leach in his *Angewin Britain and Scandinavia*. Reinhard, who has made a detailed study of the *Amadas*, quoted the Icelandic folk tale about Jón as an analogue of the graveyard episode; but the saga, being still in manuscript, was unknown to him.¹² Thus Finnur Jónsson and Reinhard were both prevented from completing a discussion of the problem because each had missed a major version: Jónsson did not know of the significance of the romance, nor Reinhard of the existence of the saga.¹³

¹⁰ For instance, in the saga Alheimr says: "Eg ætla at sækja kongs Dóttur"; in the tale: "ætla eg að sækja unnustu mína." Another sentence is repeated, but attributed to different speakers: "Dámusti mælte, 'þu skalt aldreif hennar njóta, ef eg má raaða'" (saga); and "'Aldrei skaltu hennar njóta,' segir Alheimr" (tale). The preservation of the names Alheimr and Jón in the tale is also to be noted. In the tale, the girl's father is nameless; the *rímur* corrupt Katalactus to Katalastus.

¹¹ John R. Reinhard in the *Classiques français du moyen âge* (Paris, 1926), p. vii.

¹² *The Old French romance of Amadas et Ydoine* (Durham, N.C., 1927), p. 97.

¹³ Einar Sveinsson, curiously enough, omits all mention of the *Dámusta saga* in the preface to his *Verzeichnis isländischer Märchenvarianten* (Helsinki, 1929 ["F.F.C.," No. 83]), where he discusses a number of *lygisögur*, nor does he include the story of Jón and Alheimr among the *Zaubermärchen* classified.

The pertinent section of the *Amadas et Ydoine* runs as follows:

During the absence of Amadas, Ydoine has been married, against her will, to another; but she has contrived (like the heroine of *Cligès*) to retain her virginity none the less. Amadas goes mad when he hears the news of her marriage. After his cure and a brief reunion of the lovers, the lady falls ill suddenly and is buried in a marble tomb in the graveyard. Amadas visits it at night to weep and lament in secret. He beholds a funeral procession following a bier. A large armed knight, mounted on horseback, detaches himself from them, leaps over the wall—

5659 S'adrece au mur et mult tost point;
Li cevaus les quatre piés joint,
Le mur tressaut plus d'une toise—

and challenges the right of Amadas to be present. He claims that Ydoine really loved him, and tries to prove it by showing a ring Amadas himself had given her, which she, presumably, had thereupon given to the stranger. Nevertheless, Amadas refuses to let him remove her body:

6048 "ja de chest clos
N'en portérés le cors sans moi,
Si vous dirai raison por coi:
Amee l'ai plus que ma vie."

A long combat ensues, in which Amadas finally defeats his enemy by wounding his arm:

6322 Sour le braç destre li descent
Li brans, si li fait un tel merc
Par mi la maille dou hauberc
Que l'espee o trestout le poing
Li fait voler u camp bien long.

Confessing himself worsted, the stranger now admits that Ydoine is innocent of his charges. Nor is she dead; the appearance of death was induced by putting a fairy ring (*anel faë*) on her finger. As for himself, he explains that he is a supernatural creature, immune from death by arms ("*par armes ne puis morir*"). He tells Amadas how to revive Ydoine by removing the magic ring, and then departs, causing his horse to leap over the wall as it had done upon entering, *les quatre piés joint*.¹⁴

Here we have in general the same course of events. The chief difference is that Dámusti has seriously wronged his Princess Gratfana—who, moreover, did not love him—by killing her betrothed, King Jón; whereas Amadas is the faithful lover of Ydoine, blameless toward her

¹⁴ G. Paris, *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXX (1888), 79, had argued that the graveyard episode was an interpolation in the romance; but Wolfram Zingerle, "Zum altfr. Artusroman *Li Atre perillos*," in *Zeitschr. für fr. Sprache u. Lit.*, XXXVI (1910), 274-93, refutes this claim.

and beloved by her. In other words, the deviations from the simpler situation on the part of the Icelandic are due to the injection of the moral-religious element, which clearly was not original. Eliminate it, and you eliminate precisely the characters and incidents which separate the saga from the romance. Gratfana is desired by no less than three persons: Jón, Dámusti, and the demon Alheimr. We may assume that *Amadas et Ydoine*, which economically limits the number to two, man and demon, represents the unmodified form of the plot. King Jón has been introduced into the saga in order to give Dámusti a spiritual, as well as a physical, conflict; aside from this he merely duplicates the hero's part.

Certain details connect this romance particularly with the saga: the emphasis on the demon's horse, the wound inflicted on his arm, the talisman used by him to induce the feigned death of the heroine. Still, it is possible that *Amadas et Ydoine* was an indirect, rather than a direct, source.

There are other parallels in French romance. In *L'Atre perilos*¹⁵ Sir Gawain, like Amadas and Dámusti, fights a demon champion in a graveyard where he had happened to rest on *un tombel de marbre bis*. The damsel buried in the tomb comes to life during the night and explains to Gawain that she had been reduced to madness by a wicked stepmother, until a kindly devil had offered to cure her if she would *faire del tout son plaisir*. He had carried her off on horseback and deposited her in the tomb, where he now visits her from time to time, bringing her gowns, jewels, and meat. Gawain fights the devil and defeats him by a blow on the face, from eye to chin. Thus the damsel is freed. In two other romances, *Humbaut* and *Claris et Laris*, ladies are freed from demons.¹⁶ These, however, are still more remote from the saga than *L'Atre perilos*. In *Claris*, the girl has actually been promised to the devil by her angry stepfather and mother because she had eloped with a knight to avoid the monastic life. The devil guards her in a castle until Claris rescues her. There is no graveyard scene and no simulated death.

Quite apart from the question of priority in time,¹⁷ it is apparent

¹⁵ *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, XLII (1868), 135-212.

¹⁶ *Humbaut*, ed. J. Stürzinger and H. Breuer (Dresden, 1914); *Claris et Laris*, ed. J. Alton (Tübingen, 1884).

¹⁷ Brian Wolledge, *L'Atre perilleux* (Paris, 1930), dates this poem about 1250, later than the *Amadas*. He also argues that *Claris* in its turn derived the incident of the demon lover from *L'Atre*, not from *Amadas* direct.

that *Amadas* is closest of these French romances to the saga. The *Atre perilos* is valuable for our purpose, however, since it stands closer to a group of folk tales which illuminate some aspects of our saga. A. H. Krappe has recently collected these and has pointed out their value for an understanding of Gawain's adventure; they also help to a certain extent in the interpretation of Dámusti's.¹⁸ The damsel whom Gawain rescues is clearly under the power of the devil who keeps her in magic sleep (resembling death) when he is absent. The reason given for his power over her is, as Dr. Krappe says, a most extraordinary one: demons do not ordinarily act as alienists in either romances or folk tales, but they, like giants and other monsters, do quite frequently act as kidnapers. In many stories, when a girl has been carried off against her will, her captor insures her faithfulness and docility by keeping her asleep while he is away; or he may even cut off her head and restore it by magic every evening. This procedure is ended by the hero, who revives the girl himself, learns of the external soul or fated weapon, kills the captor, and rescues the victim. Krappe, on the basis of the examples he has collected, believes the plot to be of Indian origin. However this may be, we have here the motif of the appearance of death (or sleep, which in *märchen* often means the same thing) induced by a supernatural magician who can cause resuscitation at will, and also the rescue by a mortal, both of which appear in our saga and romance. The formula is the same.

Both saga and romance, however, are less satisfactory than these analogues of *L'Atre* in one respect: they do not indicate in any way why the princess should have been subject to the demon in the first place and why her lover should be obliged to risk his life in freeing her from the spell. Both Ydoine and Gratiána are apparently innocent of any previous dealing with the monsters, probably even ignorant of their existence; and *Amadas* and Dámusti combat them merely as the result of accident: they just happen to be in the graveyard at the right moment. Another group of folk tales gives us a more logical connection of the characters. In these the demon had known the heroine during her life, had either been her lover or had wooed her and been rejected, and thereupon had for revenge killed any man who married her. Typical of these is an Irish tale¹⁹ in which a princess

¹⁸ "Sur un épisode de l'*Atre périlleux*," *Romania*, LVIII (1932), 260-64. See also Bolte and Polivka, *Anmerkungen zu den Kinder- u. Hausmärchen der Brüder Grimm*, I, 440.

¹⁹ Jeremiah Curtin, *Hero-tales of Ireland* (London, 1894), p. 114.

loses three husbands in succession, each on his wedding night. They have been carried off by Rí Doracha, the Dark King; but the brother of the last victim rescues them all and frees the heroine from her unhappy fate by defeating the Dark King in combat. This is, of course, the situation in *The book of Tobit*, where Sara's seven husbands are destroyed one after another by the evil spirit Asmodeus. Tobias puts an end to his power and frees the bride. There are many popular versions of this motif of a dangerous bride; they have recently been studied in connection with the story of Tobias by Sven Liljeblad.²⁰ Although not very close to our saga and romance, they indicate the course of events which might explain the demon's claim on the heroine and the part played by her affianced husband in rescuing her.

III

There are other formulas of international folk lore which have a general bearing on the story. These may be mentioned very briefly, since they are more remote than the two just cited.

In a fairly large cycle of popular tales a young woman who has been buried as dead comes to life in the night and is repulsed by her family (who think her a spirit) when she tries to return to them in her grave-clothes. Only her devoted lover, who had been rejected by her family, will harbor her; and he thus wins the right to marry her. This cycle (called after Ginevra, one of the most popular of the heroines) has been surveyed by Johannes Bolte.²¹ Only one version has any point of contact with our saga. This is an incident recounted by Thomas de Cantimpré in 1260 in his *Bonum universale de apibus*. Here there is a demon of some sort involved, since the girl is first aroused from her deathlike trance and conducted into the forest by a mysterious youth. Her lover finds her there, and she explains her presence thus: "Ecce, ait, vir ante me vadit, qui deducit me." When her tomb is examined, they find in it a *figmentum mirabile, quale a nullo homine fieri potuit*; this "diabolic image" is like rotten wood within and covered with skin without. It must have been placed there by the mysterious youth, but its purpose is not clear. Curiously enough, when this story reached Iceland in the fourteenth century as one of the tales

²⁰ *Die Tobiasgeschichte und andere Märchen mit toten Helfern* (Lund, 1927); especially Part II, p. 155 ff.: "Die Braut des Unholdes."

²¹ "Die Sage von der erweckten Scheintoten," *Zeitschr. für Volkskunde*, XX (1910), 353-81.

recounted by Bishop Jón Halldórsson, all hints of the supernatural were suppressed, so that it became less like the saga rather than more.²²

Only slightly similar to the *Dámusta saga*, again, are those stories in which an appearance of death is deliberately induced by the heroine in order to provide a means of joining her lover. Stories like *Cligès*, *Salomon und Markolf*, and *Romeo and Juliet* illustrate this device. The tale of Gānim the Distracted Slave of Love in the *Arabian Nights*²³ is somewhat closer to our saga, since here it is an enemy who has induced the appearance of death by inserting in the heroine's nose a piece of *benj* strong enough to put an elephant asleep. The young man who rescues her causes her to sneeze, so that she discharges the *benj* and comes to life. Her enemy, however, was no demon lover but a jealous housemistress in the Calif's palace. This woman had caused a painted image of wood to be buried in place of the wife, so that the Calif might be deceived. Finally, it may be mentioned that there are analogues in medieval literature for the necrophilia which Alheimr avows to Dámusti in the saga, but none of them is close enough to have served as source.²⁴

More interesting than any catalogue of such remote analogues is a study of the manner in which the Icelandic author has attempted to adapt his foreign story to native conditions. The results are sometimes very quaint. Just before Dámusti ambushes his rival, King Jón, the latter remarks that he (like others in the sagas) has had a dream foreboding evil; but it is too late to return now, and, continues Jón in the spirit of many other Icelandic heroes, "eitt sinn skal hverr deyja." When Dámusti has killed him, he reports what he has done to the *spekingar*. The following dialogue takes place:

"What dost thou intend to do now?" they asked.

"I shall go home to the castle to meet King Katalactus and offer him reconciliation and self-doom, if he thinks he has been somewhat misused in this deed."

"And if he will not be reconciled with thee?" they ask.

"Then I shall kill him," says Dámusti.

²² "Af konu einni kviksettri," in *Íslenskt Ævintýri*, ed. Hugo Gering (Halle, 1882), I, 254-55. The Latin text of Thomas de Cantimpré is given, *ibid.*, II, 194.

²³ Victor Chauvin, *Bibliographie des ouvrages arabes* (Liège, 1901), VI, 14 ff.; Burton's trans., VIII, 133; Lane's trans. (one-vol. ed., 1930), p. 311.

²⁴ Walter Map, *De nugis curialium*, IV, 12 (in Tupper and Ogle's trans., p. 230; bibliography, *ibid.*, p. 340); P. Hamelius, *Mandeville's travels*, "E.E.T.S.," I, 16 (bibliography of parallels, II, 34); Hroswitha of Gandersheim, *Callimachus*.

The councilors disapprove of this, saying that they will not be traitors. They use the typical Icelandic term *drottinsvikarar*. In the end Dámusti gives a full and open account of his deeds before the Thing, quite as if the events had occurred in Iceland, not far from Thingvellir; and he explains to the king that Alheimr, although resembling a troll, nevertheless had knowledge of good and evil. With all these references to *drottinsvik*, trolls, and the Thing, it is difficult for us to remember that the scene is supposed to be Constantinople. There are, to be sure, occasional reminders of the Greek setting—the use of the word *trapeza* for table, for instance—which are all the more bizarre by contrast.²⁵ We must remember, too, that the background, which unites Constantinople, Russia, and the north, corresponds to the actual trade routes frequented by Scandinavians in the Middle Ages.

Even the demon Alheimr partakes of the northern coloring. He represents the evil nature of Dámusti, of course; from the Christian point of view the real conflict is between good (the Virgin) and evil (Alheimr). But he has some arresting characteristics which do not fit into this simple scheme. We are told that he has a huge horse, hawk, and hound which are done to death by the like creatures of Dámusti. These are particularly stressed in the *rímur* and Icelandic folk tale. Of course, these three creatures are well adapted for joint mention in Scandinavian literature because their names alliterate; nevertheless, it may be recalled likewise that the three of them were jointly connected with the cult of Óðinn, as Chadwick points out, and were often burned on funeral pyres as sacrifices to the dead.²⁶ Other characteristics of Alheimr recall faintly the ancient one-eyed god. The demon is surely connected with the realm of the dead, as was Óðinn in the earliest tradition; and when he talks of the mysteries of other worlds, unknown to living men, he reminds us not only of the French and Latin parallels already pointed out but also of the Eddic poems in which Óðinn discourses on similar subjects: the *Vafþrúdnismál*, the *Grimnismál*, and parts of the *Gylfaginning*. Another character in the *Edda*, Alvíss, not only reveals his knowledge of such things in re-

²⁵ Fol. 128b: "Trapiza var sett við Siglu." There is a reference to St. Sophia as "Munstre þat, er mest er sagt í Christmenge," and a description of the harbor entrance, which was called Stólparsund.

²⁶ H. M. Chadwick, *The cult of Othin* (London, 1899), pp. 24–27 and 43.

sponse to a series of questions but also indicates that he too comes from a realm of the dead. Þórr says to him:

Hvat's þat fira?	What creature art thou?
hví 'st svá fölr of nasar?	Why so pale 'round the nose?
vast í nótt með ná?	Hast been with a corpse this night?
þursa líki	Like to a giant
þykki mér á þér vesa,	Thou dost look, methinks;
estat til brúðar borinn.	Thou wast not born for a bride.

And Alvíss replies:

Alvíss heitik,	Alvíss I'm called,
býk fyr jörð neðan,	I dwell 'neath the earth;
ák und steini stað . . .	My home under rocks I have.

If Alheimr belonged, indeed, to this race, it is a pity that Dámusti so rudely rejected the offer to be instructed by him concerning his future.

The author of the saga no doubt knew the Eddic writings as well as ecclesiastical literature in Latin and some secular literature in French. Unconsciously, it may be, he colored certain passages of his edifying tale with reminiscences of native lore. These modifications are particularly interesting. If the *maufé* of *Amadas et Ydoine* really was originally a Celtic fairy knight, as Reinhard argues, he has undergone a true sea change during his transfer to Iceland and has emerged with a strong resemblance to personages of the Scandinavian pantheon: wise Óðinn, one-handed Þórr, and that consorter with corpses, Alvíss. The change is as curious as the borrowing. Once again we find foreign themes and characters welcomed in hospitable Iceland and adapted to the native traditions and social customs. The adaptation is, however, not so complete that we are left without a clue as to the sources. It is French romance which contributed the fable of the *Dámusta saga*, despite all references to trolls, wergild, and the Thing.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY



THE ORIGINAL TELLER OF THE MERCHANT'S TALE

ALBERT C. BAUGH

IT IS fortunately not necessary in these days to prove that Chaucer was human, that at times he changed his mind, that he left the *Canterbury tales* somewhat unorganized, that he often put off revision until he had forgotten the need for it, and that it is occasionally possible to detect in his work traces of an earlier intention not completely removed. I allude to these things only because they are assumptions fundamental to my argument. And it is for the same reason that I remind the reader specifically that Chaucer transferred to the Shipman a tale which he originally intended for the Wife of Bath, without altering the lines in which the speaker includes herself among wives:

The sely housbonde, algate he moot paye,
He moot us clothe, and he moot us arraye,
Al for his owene worshiþe richely,
In which array we daunce jolily.¹

For the proposal I wish to put forward is that Chaucer, in like manner, transferred to the Merchant a tale originally intended for another pilgrim, and, as in the case of the Shipman, neglected to adapt it wholly to its new teller.

In the fifty-odd manuscripts containing more or less complete texts of the *Canterbury tales* the story of January and May told by the Merchant generally occupies one of two positions. In twenty-two manuscripts, all of the misnamed "inedited" type, it stands between the tales of the Squire and the Wife of Bath. In these manuscripts it is commonly joined to the Squire's Tale by the Squire-Franklin link slightly altered. It has no end-link.² The second position which it occupies, the usual position in manuscripts of the "edited" class, is

¹ Professor Tupper (*JEGP*, XXXIII, 352-71) holds that the Shipman's Tale was always a man's, but I feel that the device of the Globe editors of putting quotation marks around the above-quoted passage is a rather desperate attempt to remove a patent difficulty.

² In three manuscripts it is joined to the Wife of Bath's Tale by a spurious link, and in one manuscript it is followed by the end-link common to manuscripts of the edited class.

between the tales of the Clerk and the Squire, adopted in all modern editions. Here it is all but invariably provided with a special prologue and followed by an appropriate end-link. There are many reasons for believing that this arrangement represents the later intention of the poet, and we may make it the point of departure for our discussion.

The Merchant's Prologue is a woeful complaint by a man who has married a whirlwind. He begins by saying that he knows all about the weeping and wailing that the Clerk has spoken of, and so does many another married man. It is his fortune to have a wife, "the worste that may be." Though the devil himself were married to her, she would overmatch him. There is no use in detailing her faults: "she is a shrew at all." Were he once free, he would never again be caught in the snare. "We wedded men lyven in sorwe and care." Anyone who puts his words to the test will find them true, and he tells not all—God forbid!

A! goode sire Hoost, I have ywedded bee
 Thise monthes two, and moore nat, pardee;
 And yet, I trowe, he that al his lyve
 Wyfles hath been, though that men wolde him ryve
 Unto the herte, ne koude in no manere
 Tellen so muchel sorwe as I now heere
 Koude tellen of my wyves cursednesse!

The Host, who has something in common with the speaker, at least so far as experience in marriage goes, begs the Merchant to tell them more of a subject on which he speaks with such expert knowledge. And the Merchant agrees, though his own misfortunes are too sore a point with him to be discussed further.

With this momentary interruption he continues speaking. His tale is of a worthy knight of Lombardy, who, although he had reached the age of sixty and had ever followed his bodily delight on women, had never married. Then suddenly he was seized with a great impulse toward matrimony. The Merchant professes not to know whether it was through dotage or a pious desire to lead a more conventional life in his remaining years. In any case, day and night he looked for some means of satisfying his desire to know the blissful life that is betwixt a husband and his wife. Wedlock seemed a perfect state. "Thus seyde this olde knyght, that was so wise."

So far the Merchant has been reporting the views of January, assuming no responsibility for the opinions expressed. But at this point he drops his story for the time being and speaks in his own person:

And certainly, as sooth as God is kyng,
To take a wyf it is a glorious thyng.

This is a strange sentiment coming from the Merchant just after he has complained so bitterly about his own marriage. Perhaps he is not in earnest, although the words "as sooth as God is kyng" seem hardly calculated to convey irony to the pilgrims. Perhaps he is speaking in justification of January's conduct, for he adds: "and especially so if one is old and gray." A wife then is the fruit of a man's treasure. She should be young, so that she may bear him an heir and "lede his lyf in ioye and in solas." But again the impulse to generalize asserts itself. The bachelor's existence has no stability; whereas a wedded man lives a happy and well-ordered life under the yoke of marriage. Well may his heart rejoice, for who can be so obedient as a wife, so true, so devoted in sickness and in health? Some learned men, indeed, say it is not so—Theophrastus, for instance, who maintains that a good servant is cheaper and better. God curse his bones! Take no account of such foolish notions. Disregard Theophrastus and listen to me.

And now he launches on a sermon in real earnest. A wife is God's gift verily. All other gifts—lands, rents, pasture, common—are gifts of Fortune and pass as a shadow upon a wall. But a wife will last, possibly longer than you want her to. Then with a fresh inspiration he continues. Marriage is a full great sacrament. A man without a wife is truly unfortunate, lonely and helpless—that is, men in secular life. God made woman as a helpmate to Adam, which is evidence

That wyf is mannes helpe and his confort,
His paradys terrestre, and his disport.
So buxom and so vertuous is she,
They moste nedes lyve in unitee.

This pious observation is more than irony. On the lips of the Merchant it is bitter sarcasm. In the discourse of a professional preacher it would be natural, taken at its face value. Spoken by the Merchant, it cannot be taken for what it seems to be. However, this is not all. The sarcasm becomes still more biting:

A wyf! a, Seinte Marie, *benedicite!*
 How myghte a man han any adversitee
 That hath a wyf? Certes, I kan nat seye.
 The blisse which that is bitwixe hem tweye
 Ther may no tonge telle, or herte thynke.

He expands on the theme. If the husband be poor, his wife labors with him. She preserves his goods and is pleased to do his bidding. The climax of the discourse, though not the end, is reached in the apostrophe:

O blisful ordre of wedlok precious,
 Thou art so murye, and eek so vertuuous,
 And so commended and appreveed eek
 That every man that halt hym worth a leek,
 Upon his bare knees oughte al his lyf
 Thanken his God that hym hath sent a wyf,
 Or elles preye to God hym for to sende
 A wyf, to laste unto his lyves ende.

It is not easy to think of this as irony. If irony it is, the whole discourse amply justifies the description of it as "one of the most amazing instances of sustained irony in all literature." Yet there is no other way in which this long interruption to his story which the Merchant indulges in can be accepted so long as it is spoken by one who had maintained ten minutes before that wedded men live in sorrow and care, and who has sworn that if he were once free of marriage bonds he would never again allow himself to be caught.

It is necessary to insist upon the fact that whatever irony is to be seen in the passage under consideration results from the situation in which these lines are spoken, not from the nature of the ideas expressed or the form of expression. In the first place, it is inconceivable that any of the pilgrims should so completely contradict himself within the space of fifty lines as would the Merchant if his remarks about marriage in his Prologue and his tale were both spoken seriously. If we did not know of the Merchant's unfortunate experience in matrimony and his consequent disillusionment, the irony of the passage would be of a different sort, apparent only in retrospect as we look back with the knowledge of the tale he afterward tells. In the passage itself there is no hint that the speaker has his tongue in his cheek. We look in vain for the poet's usually transparent subtlety. When the friar in

the Summoner's Tale says that he who would pray must fast, it is his reason for insisting that the housewife prepare for him only some capon liver, soft bread, and a roasted pig's head. There is nothing like this in the Merchant's words. In any other context the long encomium on marriage would be taken as a sincere defense of the institution. Indeed, it has occasionally been so taken, as by no less a scholar than Richard Morris. Read by itself, the utterance is simply a sermon such as might easily have formed the discourse of a preacher expounding to a popular audience one of the sacraments of the church.

Viewed in this light, it is seen to possess other characteristics generally associated with the homiletical manner. The speaker cites authorities readily. He quotes Seneca on the nobility of a humble wife, and Cato on suffering thy wife's tongue. We have already seen that he paraphrases Theophrastus—i.e., the *Liber aureolus de nuptiis* as quoted by Jerome—in order to denounce his views. But above all, he is at home with his Bible. A wife is man's help and his comfort. They are of one flesh. The speaker knows especially well the fifth chapter of St. Paul's epistle to the Ephesians and, though he does not refer to it, adopts naturally phrases from it. "If thou lovest thyself, thou lovest thy wife." "No man hateth his flesh." He paraphrases the verse in the proverbs of Solomon: "House and riches are the inheritance of fathers; and a prudent wife is from the Lord" (19:14). He cites biblical examples of womanly virtue:

Lo, how that Jacob, as thise clerkes rede,
By good conseil of his mooder Rebekke,
Boond the kydes skyn aboute his nekke,
For which his fadres benyson he wan.

Lo, Judith, who slew Holofernes! Lo, Abigail, by good counsel how she saved her husband Nabal! And look, Esther delivered the people of God from woe and caused Mordecai to be advanced by Ahasuerus. It is true that much of this material was ready to hand in the Melibeus and that its ultimate source is Albertano of Brescia. But the fact remains that Chaucer chose to use it again here, and it is generally perilous to assume that he did not know what he was about. If the matter seems somewhat odd in the mouth of the Merchant, it is perhaps reasonable to ask whether it could have been intended originally for someone else to whom it would have been more appropriate.

And there is pretty clear evidence that it was. A few lines after the Merchant has begun his tale he describes January's situation in the words:

And sixty yeer a wyflee man was hee,
And folwed ay his bodily delyt
On wommen, ther as was his appetyt,
As doon thise fooles that been seculeer [E. 1248-51].

A good many years ago Skeat started the tradition of explaining *secular* in this passage as a reference to the secular clergy "as distinguished from the monks and friars." Yet there is no good reason for such an explanation. The use of *secular* to distinguish the lay and ecclesiastical classes was well established in Chaucer's day, and reference to the Chaucer concordance will show that this is the poet's commonest, perhaps only, use of the word. In the present passage there is no reason for distinguishing different types of the clergy. The purpose is to indicate that January's worldly way of life was that of laymen. The disparagement of the lay status implied in the words "thise fooles that been seculeer" suggests the possibility that the speaker was not of that class. A little farther along the possibility becomes a probability. The speaker is defending marriage as "a ful greet sacrament" and exploring the lonely life of one without a wife. But he is careful to add, "I speke of folk in seculer estaat" (l. 1322), thereby setting himself off pretty clearly from those to whom his generalization applies. The distinction seems to be constantly present in his mind. However men may jest about married people, such people, he says,

Of worldly folk holden the siker weye [l. 1390].

Every now and again we seem to catch the accent of the preacher:

I warne thee, if wisely thou wolt wirche,
Love wel thy wyf, as *Crist* loved his *chirche*.³

One need not stress a phrase like "a, Seinte Marie, *benedicite*!" or the ending of the tale:

Now, goode men, I pray yow to be glad.
Thus endeth heere my tale of Januarie;
God blesse us, and his mooder Seinte Marie!

since these things are found elsewhere in Chaucer. They are, however, consonant with the idea that the speaker was a member of one of the

³ Cf. Eph. 5:25.

religious orders. In short, there are apparently clear indications that when Chaucer wrote the Merchant's Tale he had in mind as the narrator not the Merchant but an ecclesiastic.⁴

For whom, then, was the tale written? The question is not so difficult to answer, I think, as might at first appear. Among the pilgrims, if we omit the Prioress and the Second Nun, to whom a fabliau would be obviously inappropriate, there are the Nun's Priest, Monk, Friar, Parson, and Pardoner. All of them are provided with tales as the collection now stands. If the Merchant's Tale was originally written for one of them, we should be prepared not only to show its appropriateness but to offer a satisfactory explanation of why it was later taken from him.

Of the five possibilities, we may at once dismiss the Parson. His simple piety would have made such a story unthinkable for him. Neither can we suppose that the Nun's Priest would have told this story in the presence of his Prioress. The Monk is a possibility. Professor Manly, remarking in another place⁵ on features "which distinctly imply that the narrator was a member of a religious order," adds, "Can it have been the Monk, retaliating for the satire on monks in the Wife of Bath's Tale (now the Shipman's)?" There are certain reasons which make this seem to me less likely than it at first appears. It should be remembered that in the "inedited" manuscripts, in which the order may reflect an earlier intention of the poet, the Merchant's Tale precedes the Wife of Bath's. A more serious objection, however, is that the pear-tree story does not seem in keeping with the character of the Monk. He is a dignified, serious-minded person. The tale which he ultimately tells is so heavy that he has to be stopped by the Knight. It is true that he had worldly tastes, expensive habits of dress, loved riding and hunting and good food, and fastened his hood with a love-knot. But there is nothing to indicate that he was the kind of person who would tell what Professor Kittredge has well called "an old indecorous jest." I think we must look farther, and we have

⁴ I notice that Professor Manly has made the same observation. In the notes to his *Canterbury tales* (p. 596) he says: "The Tale itself can hardly have been originally composed with the Merchant in mind as the narrator. In the first place, there are several lines which indicate that the narrator belonged to the clergy (ll. 1251, 1322, 1384, 1390, and 2055)." I am pleased that this part of my argument finds confirmation in the opinion of a distinguished Chaucer scholar.

⁵ *Canterbury tales*, p. 624.

left only the Pardoner and the Friar as possibilities. Both are capable of preaching a sermon and relating a story of the fabliau type. In fact, the Pardoner does just this. In popular satire there was apparently not much to choose between them, and Chaucer seems to have considered them in the same ethical class. The Pardoner was merely franker in his hypocrisy. But there is no reason for thinking that Chaucer would have taken the story of January and May from the Pardoner in order merely to have him tell another story of similar type. We are left therefore with the Friar as the only one of the five ecclesiastics who is not apparently disqualified by one circumstance or another. What positive reasons are there for attributing it to him?

No one is likely to question the appropriateness of the Merchant's Tale to the character of the Friar. What the tale calls for is a person capable of preaching a sermon, with due citation of authorities and biblical precept, and at the same time not above telling a lewd jest. The Friar fulfills these requirements much better than the Merchant. He is characterized in the opening line of the description of him in the General Prologue as "a wantowne and a merye." He takes his profession lightly. He was an easy man to give penance where he knew he would be properly rewarded. He knew the taverns well in every town and had his tippet stuffed with knives and pins to give fair wives. He harped and sang with twinkling eyes and lisped somewhat to make his English sweet upon his tongue. Surely he would not have hesitated to tell the story of January and May. But apart from his professional activity as a preacher, which would have made it natural for him to digress in his sermon-like discourse on the marriage state, he was definitely interested in marriage, helping out of his own pocket many a young woman to get a husband:

He hadde maad ful many a mariage
Of yonge wommen at his owene cost [A. 212-13].

If we grant then, for the moment, the possibility that Chaucer might have written the Merchant's Tale originally for the Friar, why did he take it away from him and give it to the Merchant? I have already remarked that in at least twenty-two manuscripts of the "inedited" type the Merchant's Tale immediately precedes the Wife of Bath's, and that this is by some thought to represent Chaucer's early intention in the matter of arrangement. Moreover, in a recent paper

on the evolution of the marriage group Professor Carleton Brown has shown quite convincingly that the Merchant's Tale (but not the Merchant's Prologue) was also *written* before the Wife of Bath's Prologue.⁶ Now it will be remembered that, in the course of writing the Wife's Prologue, Chaucer conceived the idea of enlivening the human drama with a quarrel between the Friar and the Summoner, as he had done once before in the similar quarrel between the Miller and the Reeve. Twice in the progress of the Wife's discourse she is interrupted, once by the Pardoner and once by the Friar. The former interruption leads to nothing; the Pardoner merely interjects a hearty commendation of the Wife's wisdom. But the Friar's comment, "This is a long preamble of a tale!" provokes the Summoner's wrath. Angry words pass between them, and the Host finally has to put an end to the altercation in order that the Wife may proceed with her story. No sooner has she finished, however, than the Friar, who

made alwey a maner louryng chiere
Upon the Somonour

renews the quarrel. Following the precedent of the Miller and the Reeve, he announces that he will tell a tale at the expense of a summoner, and the Summoner promises to reply in kind. Here, then, we have the explanation of Chaucer's change of narrator for the January and May story. The Friar had to be relieved of this story that he might be free to tell his story about a summoner carried away to Hell on the Devil's back. It is probably only a coincidence that the Merchant's Tale begins

Whilom ther was dwellynge in Lumbardye

and the Friar's Tale begins

Whilom ther was dwellynge in my contree;

but if my suggestion is correct and Chaucer turned to the writing of a new Friar's Tale fresh from transferring his old tale to the Merchant, the present Friar's Tale may well owe its opening line to the power of suggestion.

⁶ *PMLA*, XLVIII (1933), 1041-59. It may be remarked that this order may explain certain lines in the Wife's Prologue reminiscent of lines in the Merchant's Tale. "And lordynges, by youre leve, that am nat I" (D. 112) recalls E. 1456: "But, sires, by youre leve, that am nat I." In the Merchant's Tale Justinus warns January: "Peraunter she may be youre purgatorie!" (E. 1670); and the Wife of Bath, speaking of her fourth husband, says, "By God! in erthe I *was* his purgatorie" (D. 489).

The case for the Friar as the original teller of the Merchant's Tale is considerably strengthened, I believe, by a consideration of the interesting parallel which this tale offers with the narrative of the Pardoner. As the Pardoner and the Friar more nearly resemble each other in character than any other two pilgrims, so the Pardoner's Tale and that which I believe was originally written for the Friar are in a sense companion pieces. Both are fabliaux put in the mouths of ecclesiastics. This fact carries its own implications. More important, however, is the similarity in the conduct of the two narratives. In each the teller begins his story, only to leave it at the end of a dozen lines to enter upon a digression that runs through more than the next hundred verses. The digression is of the same sort in each case—a moral discourse in which the speaker unconsciously falls into his professional manner and, before he knows it, is preaching a sermon with all the biblical tags and rhetorical tricks customary in his professional practice. The Pardoner discourses on drunkenness (gluttony), gambling, and false swearing in a series of formal heads:

And now that I have spoken of glotonye,
Now wol I yow defenden hasardrye [C. 589-90].

Like the narrator of the Merchant's Tale, he quotes Seneca and St. Paul and supports his argument by biblical and, in this case, secular instances, introduced in the same way: "Lo, how that dronken Looth, unkyndely; Lay by his doghtres two, unwityngly . . ." (C. 455-56); "Looke, Attila, the grete conquerour"; and the like. Anyone who will read together the first two hundred lines of the Merchant's Tale and of the Pardoner's Tale will be convinced that they are constructed on one pattern.

We may inquire finally how the view here proposed squares with the textual tradition of the manuscripts. As noted above, the Merchant's Tale in manuscripts of the inedited class precedes the Wife of Bath's discourse and is itself preceded by the Squire's Tale. In about 80 per cent of these manuscripts (twenty-two, to be exact) the tale lacks the prologue that is almost always found accompanying it in manuscripts of the edited type. In other words, the Merchant's Prologue was evidently not written at the same time as the tale. It was probably added, as Professor Brown has shown,⁷ at the time the tale was shifted to

⁷ P. 1044.

its present position after the Clerk's Tale. And we may add that the words of the Host, generally known as the Epilogue to the Merchant's Tale, were probably composed at this time, for they bear a striking resemblance to the sentiments expressed in the Merchant's Prologue.⁸ It is probable that, in providing an introduction for the tale which he had given to the Merchant, Chaucer remembered it primarily as the story of January and May and thought to lend a certain appropriateness of the tale to the teller by representing the Merchant as having himself married late in life and not too well. But he overlooked the force of the long digression on marriage in the abstract, appropriate enough coming from the Friar, or intended to modify it in revision. In those manuscripts which lack the Merchant's Prologue an attempt is made to link the Merchant's Tale to the preceding Squire's Tale by utilizing the Squire-Franklin link for this purpose. This is clearly the device of a scribe or editor. The awkwardness of the change from "quod the Frankeleyn" to "quod the Marchand certayn," necessary to adapt it to the Merchant, has often been noticed. Indeed, nothing is more certain than that the link was originally written for the Franklin. His emphasis on "gentillesse," which irritates the Host, is peculiarly appropriate to him, not at all to the Merchant. In expressing the wish that his own son were like the Squire instead of being an idler, squandering his money at dice, and preferring low company, he says

I hadde levere than twenty pound worth lond,
 Though it right now were falle in myn hond,
 He were a man of swich discrecioun. . . .

It is natural for the Franklin to think in terms of land. But the conclusive evidence that the link was not written for the Merchant is in the fact that the Merchant had only been married two months "and moore nat," and could not well have had a grown son. We must believe that the use of this link to introduce the Merchant's Tale in the inedited manuscripts was something Chaucer had nothing to do with, but that the link belongs to the stage of work on the *Canterbury tales* when Chaucer decided to move the Squire on to a position just before the Franklin. While my view of the pilgrim for which the Merchant's

⁸ Like the Merchant, the Host complains of being married to a shrewish wife, is unwilling to discuss her vices at length, and wishes that he were rid of her.

Tale was originally intended is not dependent upon the interpretation which is placed upon the evidence of the manuscript tradition, and upon which scholars are far from agreeing, nothing in the manuscripts contradicts the hypothesis here proposed; such evidence as there is in the textual tradition is consonant with its plausibility.

I conceive the chain of events to have been something like the following: At one stage of his work Chaucer intended the story of January and May for the Friar. At this stage it need not have been provided with a distinctive prologue or links, but was followed, as in manuscripts of the inedited class, by the Wife of Bath's Prologue. When the idea occurred to him of enlivening the journey by a quarrel between the Friar and the Summoner, it was necessary to relieve the Friar of this tale and free him to tell a story at the expense of a summoner. At this stage we may imagine Chaucer crossing out the word "Friar" and writing "Merchant" at the head of the story. The third and last stage is that in which he decided to link the Clerk and the Merchant in one sequence and the Squire and the Franklin in another. This is the stage found in manuscripts of the edited type, and involves the writing, at this time, of the Merchant's Prologue (with the alteration of the Clerk's Envoy), the words of the Host at the end of the Merchant's Tale, and the Squire-Franklin link. The attempt to adapt the last-named link to a Squire-Merchant sequence is the work of a scribe or editor from whose text the manuscripts of the inedited type ultimately descend. He was led to this alteration by wishing to preserve the sequence Squire-Merchant-Wife of Bath, which he believed to have been Chaucer's intention and which doubtless once was. Finding somewhere a link clearly meant to follow the Squire's Tale, he inserted it after the Squire's Tale in his copy, making the necessary substitutions of "Merchant" for "Franklin," even to the detriment of both sense and meter.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

CHAUCER'S *WRETCHED ENGENDERING* AND
AN HOLY MEDYTACION

GERMAINE DEMPSTER

WHETHER or not to add to the Chaucer canon the rather long poem *An holy medytacion* is a question of importance to Chaucerians.¹ The full significance of the relevant facts having been somewhat obscured by emphasis on unimportant matters, it seems necessary to disengage the essentials and restate them in a few words.

First, the relations of the three texts should be clarified. It is a fact that the *Meditation* is indebted to the Latin verse *De humana miseria tractatus*, and this to Pope Innocent's prose treatise *De contemptu mundi*, but their dependence is not nearly so great as readers have been led to infer. To summarize the *Tractatus*, the poet's pleasure in nature leads him to reflections on the baseness of man and the vanity of this world, and this to an attack on the court of Rome. Only the section on the baseness and misery of man, i.e., only one-quarter of this 148-line piece, is translated or derived from *DCM*. The *Meditation* starts with pleasure in nature; this leads to self-abasement (about one-quarter of the 180-line poem), which the poet would escape through religious considerations. Only half the lines of the *Meditation* are translated more or less closely from the *Tractatus*, the other half being partly expansion, mostly straight innovation. The larger portion of what the *Tractatus* had translated from *DCM* is discarded by the English writer; only six lines of his *Meditation* (51, 59, 113-14, 119-20) are translation (at second hand) from *DCM*. About one (scattered) quarter of the poem is somewhat like Innocent's treatise; nothing in the other three quarters has any kind of resemblance to anything in it.

We shall consider separately the two problems: (1) Is *An holy medytacion* Chaucer's *Wretched engendering*? and (2) Did Chaucer write *An holy medytacion*?

¹ Chaucerian authorship was proposed and defended by Carleton Brown (*PMLA*, L, 997-1011, and *MLN*, LI, 296-300) and rejected by J. S. P. Tatlock and by the present writer (*MLN*, LI, 275-84 and 284-95). The present resketching has been read by Professor Tatlock and can be taken as our joint work.

1. All we know of Chaucer's work on the "wretched engendering" is that, naming with precision seven and more other works of his, he says of himself:

He hath in prose translated Boece,
And Of the Wreched Engendrynge of Mankynde,
As man may in pope Innocent yfynde. [LGW, G, 413-15.]

If words mean anything, "wretched engendering" means conception and gestation. To this Professor Brown objects that Chaucer may have used the word with reference not merely to procreation but to "man's existence as conditioned by his inheritance from Adam." But medieval usage, from which this objection apparently expects support, fails to supply Professor Brown with even one example of such loosely extensive meaning of the word "engendering"; and of course the fact that some contemporary works proceed from engendering to other human miseries would be relevant only if those works bore such a title as "Wretched engendering," which none does. Medieval usage accordingly leaves us no escape from the fact that the work to which Chaucer referred was on procreation. But the *Meditation* is not only not about procreation but expressly refuses to discuss it. This alone ought to dispose of any attempt to identify the two works.

Yet we have more. The three lines quoted above (1) imply that Chaucer's work was in prose, (2) that it was a translation, and (3) clearly state that it was taken from Innocent, or at least very closely resembled Innocent's work on the subject, i.e., a portion of the *DCM*. But (1) the *Meditation* is in verse; (2) only half its lines are translated from the *Tractatus*; over a third of it is not even expansion of *Tractatus* matter but the rhymers' independent contribution; and (3) the closeness to Innocent indicated in the last line of our quotation excludes from consideration a poem that owes nothing at first hand to *DCM*, has only six lines translated at second hand from it, is somewhat like *DCM* in only one-quarter of its length, and is, in its other three quarters, in marked contrast with it both in subject matter and in mood. That "the main substance of our poem comes," either at first or at second hand, "from Pope Innocent's *DCM*" is simply not a fact. Mr. Brown also suggests that Chaucer's line on Innocent may not imply more than a vague resemblance between the two works. But a critic who bears the burden of proof cannot support a

case already unlikely by assuming that Chaucer did not mean what his only words on the subject say.

Most Chaucerians have indulged in no speculations as to the character of Chaucer's lost work and have come with open minds to Professor Brown's suggestion. But will they accept as the "*Wretched engendrynge* As man may in pope Innocent fynde" a work that is neither on engendering nor has with Innocent's treatise any but a slight connection, and that at second hand?

2. This identification abandoned, do we find other reasons to think that Chaucer wrote the *Meditation*? What strikes us first is, on the contrary, a great dissimilarity between the contents of the poem and Chaucer's most characteristic works—not a conclusive argument against Chaucerian authorship but still one that cannot be explained away by placing the *Meditation* early in Chaucer's career since he never wrote couplets before the late eighties. As to the points adduced in favor of Chaucerian authorship, the manuscript history does not establish the slightest presumption in favor of Chaucer; the verse is more regular than most (not all) contemporary verse, and two couplets (ll. 101-2 and 129-30) are markedly like Chaucer, but all this is easily explained by a good ear and familiarity with Chaucer; the rhymes and vocabulary do not offer more characteristically Chaucerian features than do those of Chaucer's imitators, and they present several distinctly un-Chaucerian features; the style never recalls Chaucer by vigor, freshness, or variety, but only by easily borrowed phrases that make the *Meditation* Chaucerian to the same extent as an overdose of pearls and pretty feathers impart a Rembrandt character to some portraits by followers of Rembrandt. In short, having discarded the identification of Chaucer's *Wretched engendering* and the *Meditation*, we find, between the latter and Chaucer's poetry, only superficial and commonplace resemblances that suggest no more than reminiscence. No one, of course, will ever prove that the *Meditation* could not be by Chaucer, but we can say that there is no shred of support for the conjecture, a good deal against it, and not the slightest objection to the *Meditation* having been written by an admirer of Chaucer.

HAMLET AND THE SPANISH TRAGEDY
QUARTOS I AND II: A PROTEST

ELMER EDGAR STOLL

I

THE now prevailing—the orthodox—opinion is, naturally enough, that of our greatest authority in such matters, Sir Edmund Chambers.¹ He holds that Shakespeare re-wrote the lost old *Hamlet* once and no more, that *Q*₂ (1604) substantially represents the text, and Folio 1, *Q*₁ (1603), and the *Bestrafte Brudermord* (1710) are all in various ways based upon derivatives from it. And he considers a reporter, himself an actor, who had his memory charged (not too perfectly) with the lines both of Shakespeare's play and of others before it, to be responsible for *Q*₁, with (as at least one of Sir Edmund's followers thinks)² an abridged stage version of *Q*₂ to guide him.

Exactly how *Q*₁ arose I do not, protestant or heretic though I am, undertake to conjecture: it is not with the process that I am concerning myself but the result. A single re-writing seems, indeed, more probable than a repeated one. But if that part of the hypothesis, which is the less important, is accepted, the other (unless with large allowances) cannot be. *Q*₁ (as well as the *Bestrafte Brudermord* or *Fratricide punished*) cannot then be explained except as the pirating reporter (for it is unthinkable that in Shakespeare's own company it should be the abridger) fell back upon the old play (no doubt at that time still available) to eke out his languishing remembrance. There are differences in subject matter and arrangement, in the incidents and in their order, in the characters and their relations, which Sir Edmund considers to be "changes" but which, as I think, are far more probably restorations. Despite the crudity and confusion in detail, *Q*₁ is, as others have recognized, in its main masses and larger outlines, more coherent than *Q*₂; there signs of dislocation, as might be expected in a rapid re-writing rather than in a firsthand creation, are

¹ William Shakespeare (1930), I, 411-25.

² A. H. Hart, "The vocabulary of the First Quarto of *Hamlet*," *RES*, XII (1936), 18-30. Sir Edmund also seems to imply an abridged stage version as he speaks of an underlying "transcript" (p. 416).

sometimes more evident than in Q_1 ; and it is fairly incredible that an actor-reporter, even if he sometimes could pen fairly passable blank verse, should make changes in the structure of the fable that would not clash with the rest of it and would so nearly correspond to what we know or might expect of the old play. The old *Hamlet* was apparently the inspiration of Kyd's *Spanish tragedy*, which is but that story transposed—revenge by a father for a son instead of by a son for a father—and was probably, as most scholars until of late have thought, by the same author. Nashe's well-known allusion, in his epistle to Greene's *Menaphon*,³ implies it; the similarity in situation and style of the *Spanish tragedy* and Q_1 , not to mention Q_2 itself, points to a common origin; and Sir Edmund's theory of only a possible influence by the *Spanish tragedy* upon the reporter seems (to a mere student of drama, with no bibliographical pretensions) unreasonably roundabout—a painful effort to avoid the natural conclusion.

II

The question of the *Spanish tragedy*'s relation to the lost Danish play is a necessary preliminary to the question of Q_1 's relation to Q_2 . That the play was written later than the old *Hamlet* and by the same author is probable not only because of the striking similarities in the stage devices and the details of the story, in the phrasing and the rhythm peculiar to Q_1 and unlike Shakespeare's own, but even because it is, as we have seen, practically the same story turned round. In both tragedies there is a truly Senecan *atrocitas*—revenge as a duty and also (despite the delay) as a delight in itself and for the intrigue involved. In both there is war in the background, between Spain and Portugal, or Denmark and Norway; and ambassadors pass to and fro. In both not only the ghost but the hero cries out "revenge!" as we learn from the early allusions of Lodge and Dekker.⁴ And there are details like the ghost's demanding revenge repeatedly, the wearing of black and the swearing on the cross of the sword; the secret of the murder, or of the murderer's identity, revealed but requiring to be

³ In 1580. The satirist speaks of "the Kidde in Aesop," "the trade of *Noverint* whereto they were borne" [the dramatist's father was a scrivener], and "whole Hamlets, I should say, handfulls of tragical speeches"; and he jeers at the abundant use of Seneca. Nashe's use of the satirical plural, a stumblingblock to some scholars, is not extinct today. "Aren't we elegant!" says the chap not dressed to one who is. The plural has the advantage of remoteness.

⁴ *Wit's miserie* (1596); *Westward ho!* (1603-4).

verified; the doubt of the ghost's revelations or of the lady's message and the doubt definitely removed; feigned madness on the part of the revenger and real madness on the part of a woman; delay and self-reproaches, with a contrast established between this revenger and another whose son had been murdered; meditations on suicide, book in hand, and the revenger's cunning and dissimulation to match the murderer's; the sweetheart of the son lectured upon her behavior by father and brother; the revenger's confederacy with the lady (or with his mother and his friend); a discussion of theatrical art by the hero; and a play-within-the-play, in the *Spanish tragedy* for the purpose of revenge instead of discovery or verification, but turning out, like the fencing match in *Hamlet*, to be more than it has pretended to be, effecting not only revenge but the destruction of all the leading characters concerned.⁵

Now, since there is no direct source for the *Spanish tragedy*, these striking similarities point clearly to the old *Hamlet*, of which the source is Belleforest's prose tale. It is altogether contrary to the probabilities and to the natural course of things, in Elizabethan drama or in any other, that the legendary story should have been changed and varied first and reproduced in its purity afterward. To do that would be a needless expenditure of inventive effort and the abandonment of the advantage, by dramatists almost universally acknowledged, which arises from familiar, supposedly historical, material. Moreover, the old *Hamlet* was very popular; and what would author and company then desire but to repeat the success, not of course by duplicating but, as here, by transposing and otherwise varying the story. The novel uses of the old situations and bits of "business" are only in keeping with the somewhat different requirements. It has been thought that the *Spanish tragedy* must be the earlier because the ghost is not an integral part of the action, as in *Hamlet*, but a prologue or chorus, as in Seneca. In the transposed story, however, there is no need of the ghost's intervening: the murder being known, only the authors of it require ferreting out, and that provides occupation for the revenger. If, then, there is retrogression in the use of the supernatural, there is, on the other hand, progress in the plotting, with little delay to be explained. For the purposes of verification

⁵ See Boas' *Kyd*, p. xlvii, and Thorndike's "Hamlet and contemporary revenge plays," *PMLA* (1902), to which I am here indebted.

there was now no need, either, of the theatrical entertainment; the device, however, with the revenger treating his victim ironically, was too effective to be abandoned. The denouement, a fencing match that resulted in a duel and a slaughter, might have been repeated. But Kyd, as is at present recognized, even by those who deny him the old *Hamlet*, was, for his day, a highly original and resourceful man of the theater; and what he did was to combine the two devices. Having now no use for the play-within-the-play at the crisis, he put it at the end. He kept the effect of spectacle, bloody sensation, and ironical retribution as in the denouement of the Danish tragedy, but he heightened the effect of surprise and cunning. Quite conceivably, of course, he might, at these points, have been merely influenced by the old *Hamlet*, as penned by another hand. But then that play must have been penned by his double, though a greater than he, of whom we have heard nothing, who, likewise, wrote better dramatic blank verse and framed better plots and situations than Marlowe (and before him) in *Tamburlaine*; and any "influence" the author of the *Spanish tragedy* in turn had upon *Q*₁ must have been merely verbal, and very slight and questionable besides. All that, at the outset, seems roundabout.

III

Sir Edmund recognizes "two important structural changes" in *Q*₁: one in the order of the tests applied to ascertain the cause of Hamlet's strange conduct and the other in the matter of reporting the king's murderous perfidy. The tests are three:

In interviews with Rosencrantz and Guildenstern (the Schoolfellow scene), with Polonius (the Fishmonger scene), with Ophelia (the Nunnery scene). The sequence in *Q*₂ and *F* is as follows. The King plans the Schoolfellow test (ii. 2. 1-39). Polonius plans the Ophelia test (ii. 2. 85-167). Hamlet appears reading, and Polonius improvises his own test (ii. 2. 168-223). The Schoolfellow test is carried out (ii. 2. 224-323). Then the arrival of the Players intervenes (ii. 2. 324-634). The failure of the Schoolfellow test is reported (iii. 1. 1-28). Finally the Ophelia test is tried (iii. 1. 28-196).

In *Q*₁ the Ophelia test immediately follows its planning. Why the change should have been made, says the critic, is not clear. He thinks it can hardly be ascribed to the reporter—does he imply that it should be to the abridger? The reporter, he faithfully notices, generally gets the succession of his episodes right, and the link-passages in *Q*₁ indi-

cate "a careful modification to fit the new order. Possibly it was an attempt to remove an original inconsistency, characteristic enough of Shakespeare, by which Ophelia is bidden to accompany her father to the King in ii.1 after her tale of Hamlet's visit, in disarray, to her chamber but left out in ii.2."

No wonder Sir Edmund says the reason for the change is not clear; and his explanation makes it, for me, no clearer. There is an a priori improbability in his whole position. Why should a mere reporter in the employ of a piratical publisher (or an abridger) set up at the same time as an author or reviser? Why, above all, should he change the name of Polonius to Corambis, of Reynaldo to Montano? What both publisher and public wanted was the *Hamlet* that, revived and revised, had scored a success greater than ever. Why now should the chief comic character be given a new name? Shakespeare's version, of course, was jealously guarded; the stage version available, probably pieced together out of the parts of the more approachable actors, must have been decidedly incomplete; but the reporter reproduced of it what he could, and when memory failed or actors' parts were not forthcoming he would naturally fall back on the old play, which was *Hamlet* too. Of this some actors' parts or even the whole manuscript might well be more easily obtainable; and the differences of style would not trouble the reporter. They did not, his text makes manifest; and in Q₂ the inconsistencies of mere factual detail such as trouble Sir Edmund would not either—not enough, at any rate, to make him eliminate them.

What are these, more particularly? In Q₁ the placing of the nun-nery scene, with the use of Ophelia for the purpose of sounding him, immediately after the report of Hamlet's derangement, for love of her, corresponds to that in the *Brudermord*: and not only is more in keeping with the earlier, simpler, and (as I think) Kydian art, but is more logical. Shakespeare, by putting the important test last, in Act III, just before the mousetrap, has secured an effect of suspense, of gradual development and climax, with the threat—"Those that are married already, all but one"—and with the king's consequent resolve upon England, but not the effect of coherence or probability.⁶ Indeed, he has left what seem to me vestiges of the old arrangement.

⁶ Cf. Mr. Granville-Barker's *Hamlet* (1937), pp. 190-202. In challenging the orthodox opinion concerning Q₁ the great critic has anticipated me in print.

II, i, where the girl has told of Hamlet's visit, ends with her father's words, "Come go with me, I will go seek the King. . . . Come go we to the King. . . . Come," and out they go together. But in scene ii she does not appear. Sir Edmund thinks "the change" is in Q_1 , where she does appear, "an attempt to remove an original inconsistency, characteristic enough of Shakespeare." Characteristic enough, but the evidence points rather to a change on Shakespeare's own part and to another inconsistency or carelessness as characteristic. Instead of putting the imperative in, he fails to cut it out. "Come go we," cries his Polonius repeatedly and excitedly, like that in Q_1 , and very probably like that in the lost original, for in the circumstances it is the natural thing to say and do; but his Ophelia must not really "go," or if she does, not remain there, since, after his saying that the prince's custom is to walk here in the lobby, and his proposing that, making use of Ophelia, they spy upon him, the prince, as in Q_1 , draws near so patly, "poring upon a book." In the circumstances it is, again, the natural thing to apply the test immediately. This "business" of the hero's was apparently so arranged that under cover of his abstraction the conspirators could bestow themselves, and as a result of the postponement, since the hero manifestly could not be required to drop in like that a second time, he must then, for the same purpose, be summoned, and be given only the meditative soliloquy ("To be or not to be"), without the book which motived it; with Ophelia here at hand, that the conspirators should not now at once avail themselves of the opportunity thus thrust upon them requires some explaining—"at such a time" is insufficient—and even so, if they did thus avail themselves originally, it would disappoint the audience. Why, with such luck and with no other clue, should they postpone this test if it ever be worth the making? Shakespeare, no doubt, had objections (as the original author might not have had) to Ophelia's hearing Polonius discuss Hamlet's love and read his letters; and probably he did not want the chief test undertaken with so little preparation and in reliance upon such a coincidence as Hamlet's immediate appearance; nevertheless in Q_2 , though he leaves the young lady out, he keeps the hero's pat entrance and lets Polonius, to little purpose, make use of it himself. After the nunnery scene, as in Q_1 , the "fishmonger" passage has, in the way of detection, little point, now that the clue is abandoned—"Love!" scoffs the king—but it has still less before.

With his clue still in hand and no other, why should the old fellow "board" the prince alone, without either witnesses behind the arras or Ophelia beside him?

Even on the surface, moreover, apart from such considerations of internal probability, Sir Edmund's conclusion is not probable. Why should reporter or abridger take such liberties with Shakespeare's text and put himself to such trouble? To remove the "original inconsistency" all that he needed to do was to drop out the "Come, go we together," and read simply, "I will to the King." On the other hand, he has gone the lengths of introducing (instead of, as I take it, retaining) link-passages "to fit the new order" (instead of the old). Polonius must now at this point make arrangements to get rid of the queen, station Ophelia with a book in the open and the king and himself under cover. And after the nunnery scene is over he must now offer some justification for probing him himself, after the king scoffs at his conjecture:

Cor. Wel, something it is: my Lord, content you a while.
I will my selfe goe feele him: let me worke.
Ile try him euery way: see where he comes,
Send you those Gentlemen. let me alone
To finde the depth of this, away, be gone.

Those gentlemen are Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, whose entry, presently, is thus motivated as it is not in Q_2 ; and that is not the only place where, despite the mutilation of the text, such matters of joinery are better attended to. For instance, the queen's consent is procured before the final test is undertaken, in her closet. Is it likely that either the abridger or the reporter would of himself be more particular in such matters than the original dramatist, or take such pains to amplify matter too abundant already? That is roundabout again.

Besides, with the order of the scenes as it is in Q_1 , Hamlet's disrespectful treatment of Polonius is, in both scenes concerned, much more natural and intelligible. As at several other points in his revision, notably the motives for Hamlet's madness and his delay, Shakespeare presumes a familiarity with the popular old melodrama. The counselor has as yet done the hero no ill turn. But in Q_1 the position of the nunnery scene, now in III, i, immediately after the entry in II, ii, "poring upon a book," and before he is "boarded" by

Polonius alone, gives Hamlet the needed provocation in the boarding colloquy. Polonius has been spying and Ophelia lying. Shifting the nunnery scene for emotional and climacteric effect⁷ to its present position before the "Murder of Gonzago," and keeping the "boarding" or "fishmonger" passage where it was, the dramatist preserves Hamlet's satirical and disrespectful attitude to him simply as that already familiar to the audience, or as warranted only by the wiseacre's preposterous report of the visit which the prince himself has not heard. Indeed, he couldn't have changed the attitude without changing the scene.

For coherence' sake he should have changed it, or else kept the nunnery scene where it was. Shakespeare has provided only for the deferring of the Ophelia test, as he makes Polonius say, "At such a time I'll loose my daughter to him." For the disrespectfulness Professor J. D. Wilson has himself provided by taking the word "loose" to be a term of the stud and stable, and by interpolating an earlier entrance for the hero, whereby he overhears the word and at once jumps to the conclusion that the good old busybody is planning to prostitute his daughter. Therefore, when the time has come to bid her get her to a "nunnery," that word, in turn, now after three centuries, means a "brothel." Whether Hamlet in this scene detects Polonius listening or not, it is only after that, as in *Q*₁, that there is point, when he is "boarded," to his immediately calling him a "fishmonger," or bawd, or even to his "harping on my daughter" and bidding him not let her "walk in the sun." There this bad meaning for an innocent word, long accepted by commentators, is, unlike the two bad ones adopted by Mr. Wilson above, supported by what immediately follows, but not in *Q*₂, as in *Q*₁, by anything that has gone before. In *Q*₂ all that Polonius has yet done is to cut Ophelia off from Hamlet—not artfully throw her in his way—and to make her return his letters. And the earlier stage entrance, provided by Mr. Wilson, whereby the prince overhears but no more than "loose my daughter to him," a thing which, in this version, to be sure, Polonius is to do not until considerably later, is, even if the word were so unambiguously wicked, a quite meager and insufficient dramatic preparation. By all the canons of dramatic art there must have been some sign that the word

⁷ *Art and artifice in Shakespeare* (1933), chap. v. and previous studies

was overheard, thus understood, and then resented. Even an Ibsen, with an audience of highbrows, could not expect a situation to hinge upon a dubious monosyllable, without some outward demonstration to support it. In fact, such overhearing and mistaken suspecting, for neither of which there is evidence in either Quarto, lower Hamlet's intellectual prestige. One of the good effects of the role, particularly in Q_2 , is the hero's uncanny perception. Later he rightly suspects Rosencrantz and Guildenstern as soon as he sees them; he suspects the king's treacherous purpose of sending him to England with little time or occasion for so unerring a conjecture, and he has a premonition before the fencing match; he of course suspects Ophelia (though not, to be sure, as Mr. Wilson would have him do) when he finds her reading a pious book, then playing a part, and returning his gifts, in the nunnery scene; and, in Q_1 , meeting Polonius' guilty look, as he does immediately after that, he naturally and properly suspects him in turn, if he has not done so before (though not, to be sure, of being a bawd). "Do you know me, my Lord?" "Excellent well, you are a fishmonger." "How pregnant his replies are!" Polonius later observes, though he does not see the pregnancy here. But the audience see it, as in Q_2 they cannot; and in shifting the nunnery scene for tragic effect Shakespeare has here lost a comic one. In Q_1 this is heightened by the memory that the egregious counselor has, in hiding, already heard the prince's recommendation that he should play the fool nowhere but in his own house. And in Q_1 , at the first encounter after his visit in disarray to Ophelia's chamber, the prince's detection of the spying and lying is more natural for him and more intelligible to the audience. This is the test that he and they had been expecting; and in Act III—in Q_2 —the audience are reminded of it as Polonius sets the stage for it, but Hamlet is not there, whereas in Act II—in Q_1 —he needed not be.

IV

As for the second "structural change," in the matter of reporting the king's murderous perfidy, that, too, I think is more nearly the arrangement in the old play.

. . . . Q_1 omits altogether iv. 6, in which Horatio receives Hamlet's letter about his voyage and v. 2. 1-74, in which Hamlet and Horatio discuss the same matter, and substitutes in the place of iv. 6 a different scene, in which

Horatio, after Hamlet's return, tells the story of the voyage to the Queen. Here the original version must be that of Q2 and F, since v. 2. 1-74 is represented in *B.B.*

If this is so, why, again, any change? Perhaps to remove another "original inconsistency," for Professor Schücking has taken the position that the gravediggers scene is an afterthought. But that implies a second re-writing on the part of Shakespeare; besides, in itself the position is, as I have elsewhere given reason to think, untenable.⁸ There is no discussion between Hamlet and Horatio before the gravediggers scene mainly for the simple reason that then, with the hero already informed of Ophelia's madness and drowning, and of Laertes' outbreak in resentment, the scene as it stands would be both less pathetic and less exciting; and here is another case of "naïve perspective," for a higher emotional effect, as near the end of II, ii, where the prince arranges for the "Murder of Gonzago" and a speech of his own penning and inserting, but in the ensuing soliloquy, after his long indictment of himself for his inactivity, has the happy thought "the play's the thing" as if he had not arranged for that already.⁹ Really the "change" in IV, vi and V, ii, 1-74 is not to remedy a Shakespearean inconsistency but is part and parcel of a more flawless but more external consistency in Q₁ and presumably in its earlier model.

To this we for a moment turn. In Q₁ the discussion of the treacherous packet in V, ii is somewhat superfluous because in IV, vi it has already been told to the queen. But that is in keeping with the relations between Hamlet and his mother as established in the closet colloquy. There, as not in Q₂, the matter of the murder and the intended revenge comes out into the open, the queen disavowing complicity and promising not only concealment but assistance. So the queen is cleared and promises assistance in Belleforest, source of the old play; so the duchess is cleared, the mother of the revenger, and though she does not promise assistance, she gives it in Marston's *Antonio's revenge* (1599), which is known to be indebted to both the old play and the *Spanish tragedy*. And Bel-imperia, sweetheart of the murdered, who has no need of clearing, promises secrecy and assistance in almost exactly the same words.

⁸ In *Shakespeare and other masters*, to be published presently by the Oxford University Press.

⁹ See my *Hamlet the man* ("English Association Pamphlets" (March, 1935)), p. 18; also, for further examples, the book referred to in n. 8.

I will conceale, consent, and doe my best,
What stratagem so'ere thou shalt devise,

cries the queen. So vows the Spanish lady, in the same situation:

Hieronimo, I will consent, conceale,
And ought that may effect for thine availle,
Joyne with thee to revenge Horatioes death.

Hieron. On then; whatsoever I devise
Let me entreat you, grace my practices [IV, i, 45-49].

What is almost as significant, these passages in the closet scene and in IV, vi, like several other parallels nearly as close,¹⁰ cited by Sir Edmund himself as possibly owing to the influence of the *Spanish tragedy* instead of the old play, and by way of the reporter's "failing" memory instead of a manuscript, are, as a whole, decidedly in an earlier style and rhythm, and, like them, seem to be by no means so garbled or mutilated in the process as what is recognizably Shakespearean. (Here, evidently, there is less dependence upon memory; the *Spanish tragedy*, in fact, was by 1592 in print!) The same is to be said also of a series of passages, cited by Sir Edmund, which he would not call pre-Shakespearean but "un-Shakespearean,"¹¹ and in which "one is certainly tempted to find patches of an alien hand or hands." Undoubtedly alien, and if not pre-Shakespearean, exceedingly old-fashioned for 1603. And yet, as he candidly acknowledges, "certainly one ought not to bring in an expensive hack-poet for a surreptitious enterprise, of which the profits could not be great"; ignoring, however, what I urge above, that a new play—still less one in an earlier, antiquated style—was not what was wanted.

All this, I must think, is more roundabout still. Sir Edmund is, of course, too learned and wise "to be dogmatic upon a very obscure question"; yet how much more natural the alternative which he lightly passes over: that "some contamination of Q 1 by the old

¹⁰ William Shakespeare, I, 422.—To save space I do not here take up the matter (touched upon in *Hamlet the man*, cited in the foregoing) of the resemblance between Kyd's Hieronimo and the Hamlet of both Quartos at one conspicuous point. They have the same seriousness mingled with grim mirth, poetry seasoned with homely figure and colloquialism. Cf.: "Hieronimo, 'tis time for thee to trudge [into the other world]" with "Ay, there's the rub," "shuffled off this mortal coil, etc.," "The potent poison quite o'ercrows my spirit," "make mouths at th' invisible event." Cf. also "And heere Ile have a fling at him, that's flat" with "Now might I do it pat . . . trip him that his heels may kick at heaven." Possibly there is no connection; possibly Hieronimo "influenced" Shakespeare's Hamlet; but neither seems the natural explanation.

¹¹ P. 419.

play is of course a possibility"! It is a decided probability, with a text instead of mere memory as the source of it, when we consider the far greater accuracy in the reproduction of the "un-Shakespearean" matter. If the greater accuracy in the passages supposed to be taken from the *Spanish tragedy* be due to the availability of the text, that in the other un-Shakespearean matter is probably owing to a similar circumstance; and since the reporter was not expected to refashion the play, and the author of both texts was (so far as indirect evidence, external and internal together, can prove anything) the same person, the texts here actually employed were probably no more than one.

As a result of this difference in the situation, moreover, the closet scene has much more point and importance in Q_1 , such as might be expected in the lost original. It offers disclosures, it provides peripeteias—in Kyd's style rather than in Shakespeare's at this period. In Q_2 the interest lies not in Hamlet's discovery of the queen's innocence, or in the queen's learning of the murder and the intended revenge, or in the fact that she would help him, but in the development of their emotional relations to each other. In Q_1 , because not only of the circumstances mentioned above, but of others to be mentioned presently, the scene is the crisis of the play, with a sharp external irony asserting itself, as not in Q_2 . There it appears that England is already determined upon, as Hamlet himself makes known. Not so in Q_1 . There the prince is deported because of the killing of the counselor; and the scene is ironical for both. Polonius goes to overhear the truth and almost does, for, as not in Q_2 , the hero really tells it; Hamlet thinks now to kill the king, whom he has just spared, but finds him to be Polonius, wins the assistance of the queen, but is sent packing before he can make use of it. Besides, the scene is more of a reversal so far as the relations of son and mother are concerned, like, again, the corresponding one in *Antonio's revenge* and the *Brudermord*. Hamlet here is more Orestean; something of the soul of Nero has entered his firm bosom. As in the *Brudermord*, he locks the doors at the outset, and as both there and in Marston's play, in his conduct he lends more color to the queen's impression that he means to kill her. And here, as in both the other plays, the ghost's appearance is evidently to protect her, not merely to remind the hero of his duty.

Now this external but strikingly dramatic and ironical situation is quite in keeping with the spirit both of the Spanish tragedy and also of what we know of the Danish. It is the strikingly dramatic and ironical situations of both tragedies—the ghost scenes, the mad scenes, the play-within-the-play in the Danish one and that which turns out to be no play at all in the Spanish, the graveyard scene and Hieronimo's sitting in judgment on a murderer—that prompted the re-writing of the old-fashioned but picturesque lines by the greatest dramatists of the day, Shakespeare and Jonson. And the confederacy of the queen with the hero, the franker and fuller discussion of the crime and of measures for its punishment by them and with Horatio, are more in the spirit of Kyd's grim art and what we may presume to have been the plot and spirit of the Senecan melodrama. In the *Brudermord*, Hamlet keeps his secret still less than in Q₁. After the ghost scene he then and there reveals to Horatio and Francisco both that it is a matter calling for vengeance, and to Horatio alone—not off-stage, some time before the mousetrap—he tells the whole story. If he is Orestes, the other is Pylades; and that is not the only apparent point of contact between the conjectural old stage story of Hamlet, and the Euripidean one of his Hellenic prototype, in which the confederacy of two men and a woman plays a part still larger.¹² Kyd, a Merchant Taylors boy, knew Latin, certainly, and possibly Greek. And in *Antonio's revenge*, which is deeply indebted to both the old *Hamlet* and the *Spanish tragedy* there is not only confederacy with the duchess, who corresponds to the queen—as in the latter play with Bel-imperia, who corresponds to Ophelia—but also with the hero's friends.

Shakespeare, as I have several times¹³ pointed out, has intentionally put the prince into a heroic and pathetic isolation, Horatio being his only confidant—and then mostly off-stage—but not his assistant. In general, of course, Shakespeare imparted a greater dignity and refinement to the characters, not only to Hamlet and Ophelia, but to the king and queen. Her innocence of her husband's death is simply presumed; it is not made so explicit because the direct charge of murder and the project of revenge must not be made known to her. Hamlet's talk with her is to satisfy himself, "to save her soul," to

¹² See my *Hamlet* (1919), Appendix.

¹³ See my *Art and artifice in Shakespeare*, chap. v, etc.

keep her from contamination by the king. The king himself, and Hamlet in relation to him, are in Q_2 much more elevated in manner, even after allowances for the difference between a reporter's clumsy, misprinted, sometimes muddled version and the poetry of a master-hand. Claudius is less fulsome in his hypocrisy and treachery as he discloses his plan of banishment and murder. In Q_2 he speaks of it, more and more definitely, four several times, instead of twice as in Q_1 ; but of the banishment in the queen's presence (and then with her alone) only once, and no oftener to Hamlet. To the queen he says nothing, in IV, i, that corresponds to this that follows in Q_1 , but much the same thing in the *Brudermord*:

Our letters to our deare brother of England
For Hamlets welfare and his happinesse:
Happly the aire and climate of the Country
May please him better than this native home.

And to Hamlet himself he says nothing, in IV, iii, that corresponds to this which follows; but in the *Brudermord*, III, x, he speaks of his own "fatherly care" and, I, vii, of his own "love" and his desire that "no harm should come to you":

Well sonne, we in care of you: but specially
In tender preservation of your health,
The which we price even as our proper self. . . .

In this scene of Q_2 , as not of Q_1 , the queen is absent, and yet, as there, Hamlet bids her alone farewell. "Thy loving Father, Hamlet," the king interposes, hypocritically enough. "My mother," Hamlet insists, and thus his impertinence is made still more pointed but the indecorum of hypocritical menaces against the son in his mother's own presence is done away with.

It is possible, of course, that putting the queen actually on the stage is another attempt to remove an original inconsistency; it is possible that both reporter and abridger in their simplicity and crudity naturally reverted to the Kydian simplicity and crudity, without direct or definite knowledge of it. They did so, then, with remarkable success and exactitude. This fulsomeness of hypocrisy, this irony of a friendly-deadly role, with covert menaces on the part of the villain and the supposedly mad revenger both, much more prominent in Q_1 than in Q_2 , is just the sort of thing you find in the

Spanish tragedy and in *Antonio's revenge*, the *Brudermord*, and *Titus Andronicus*, which are all in the same tradition. But there is one definite form of hypocritical fondness and intimacy that cannot well be explained if Q_1 and the German play depend only on Q_2 , even with the *Spanish tragedy* influence added. In both, the hero calls the king "Father" as he never does in Q_2 ; and the king is much more affectionate with him, calling him "Son" (or, in the *Brudermord*, "dearest Prince"), as he does directly but once in Q_2 , at the outset, receiving (whether he hears it or not) a rebuff for his pains. That is in the vein of Hieronimo's and Antonio's obvious but treacherous irony. In the *Brudermord* the method of address, like Corambus as the name for Polonius, and the other resemblances mentioned in the foregoing, may be owing (though Sir Edmund does not allow for this) only to the influence of Q_1 ; but that does nothing to clear up the origin of it in Q_1 , or to explain the fact that it harmonizes with the simple and comparatively primitive or childish spirit there.

V

The "structural changes" in Q_1 are, then, important and far-reaching, in a measure that Sir Edmund, who himself would not here be taken for infallible, seems, to a protestant at least, not to have adequately considered; and at many points these have the remarkable effect of making the play both more coherent and intelligible and also more like what we might expect of the pre-Shakespearean. Not only is it improbable that a reporter should have exerted himself to change or (as he thought) to amend the original, it is also incredible that in doing this he should so nearly bring about a restoration. He was no scholar, no Sarrazin or C. M. Lewis, bent on reconstructing the old play, and he did not look about him at kindred plays like Kyd's and Marston's for the materials. In a reconstruction he had no interest. He followed Shakespeare as far as he could, particularly in the language; and in the plot, the order of events and their connection, he often followed the old play perforce, having no other complete scenario before him. His stumbling memory and fumbling pen explain the omission and clumsy perversion of Shakespeare's lines, but not the comparative correctness of those which are Kydian or "un-Shakespearean"; neither his memory nor his invention explains a stage

performance more coherent and externally intelligible than Shakespeare's own and similar in structure and detail to the *Spanish tragedy* and the other plays connected with the lost one. Such a bungler and flounderer in verbal and metrical matters would not have produced a play that where it differs from Q_2 should have held together so well—at those points better than Shakespeare's own—and where it sounds like Kyd's should owe this only to the "influence" of his later tragedy, the earlier one's counterpart. What happens in the way of factual "inconsistency" we have seen already when it is a master of the craft at work on the tragedy in question; something the same, as is well known, happened in the case of Jonson at work on the counterpart; and how much more we might expect when it is a novice depending on his memory or an incomplete stage version—one, at any rate, that (for some reason or other) he often fails to follow!

Exactly how Q_1 arose does not matter; it does not matter whether Shakespeare re-wrote *Hamlet* once or twice, for the relation of Q_1 to Q_2 and the lost old play remains unchanged. If but once, the reporter had recourse to the old play directly; if twice, leaving the first time much of the old play untouched, the reporter may not have needed to go back to the old play himself. A single re-writing, in Q_2 , is more probable because more like Shakespeare, who was not much given to retracing his steps; and because there would otherwise be no explanation for the comparative correctness in Q_1 of what is evidently pre-Shakespearean. The relation, however, is the important thing; not the process, but the result. What we need to know is what the old play was like, not who its author was; what changes Shakespeare made in it and the reason for them, not whether he made them at one sitting or at two. The process is important only when a theory of it interferes with our understanding of these; and that I cannot but think—in the formula of heresy, "Ich kann nicht anders!"—the theory of Sir Edmund does.

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Gon
refo
the
thir
472-
worl
East
stan
reall
copy
2
581-
a stu
one
cont
for h
astro
can h
of Gi
Gior
justif
or in
4
J
uncrit
limiti
Antho
been
into E
himse
'is cov
[MODE

THE DATE OF GODWIN'S *DOMINGO GONSALES*

GRANT MCCOLLEY

SHOULD the reader of *The man in the moone*, or the *Voyage of Domingo Gonsales* turn to the *DNB* for the date when this posthumous publication was composed,¹ he would learn that the work was written when the author was a student at Christ Church,² that is, between the years 1578 and 1584.³ Should convenience lead him rather to the *History of aeronautics in Great Britain*, he would find the date of composition as ca. 1590.⁴ In the *Introduction to the literature of Europe in the XV, XVI and XVII centuries* of Henry Hallam, he would ascertain that the *Voyage* was written after 1599 and before the death of Elizabeth in 1603, while Godwin was a student at Christ Church (italics mine).⁵ This is a unique situation for a work which

¹ For the reason that it is the most generally available, the text normally cited for the *Gonsales* is that reprinted in 1888 in *Anglia* (X, 428-52), to which edition all possible references are made. In this edition, usually known as that of the *Harleian miscellany*, the first five paragraphs are the addition of Nathaniel Crouch who, as I point out in "The third edition of Francis Godwin's *The man in the moone*" (*Library*, N.S., XVII [1937], 472-75), inserted the description of the island of St. Helena when he reprinted Godwin's work as the second of four sections in *A view of the English acquisitions in Guinea and the East Indies* (London, 1686). It also was Crouch who "thought fit to republish the substance thereof," and omits words, sentences, and passages, including a number of Godwin's realistic dates. I shall in the near future make available a text based upon the unique copy of the first edition of London, 1638, now at the British Museum.

² The source of the date given in the *DNB* is the *Athenae oxonienses* ([London, 1721], I, 581-82) of Anthony à Wood, which states that the *Gonsales* was written while Godwin was a student at Christ Church, and properly gives this period as 1578-84. Wood, who was one year of age when Godwin died, and whose *Athenae oxonienses* is based largely upon contributed material gathered by him after 1680, provides neither source nor authority for his date of the composition of the *Gonsales*. The indicated interest of Domingo in astronomy while a student at Salamanca, reputedly the first university where the Copernican hypothesis was taught (*The man in the moone* [London, 1638], p. 53), and the presence of Giordano Bruno in Oxford during April, May, and June of 1583 (J. Lewis McIntyre, *Giordano Bruno*, p. 21), lend some color to Wood's unsupported statement, but scarcely justify a conclusion that the work was written at that time. It perhaps was contemplated, or in part begun, during these years, but such a conclusion is at best conjecture.

³ Godwin may not have been in residence throughout the entire period.

⁴ J. E. Hodgson (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), p. 8.

⁵ (London, 1847), III, 168-69. The conflicting dates of Hallam are occasioned by an uncritical adoption of the university period given by Wood, whose dates he believes he is limiting. Hallam states in part that the *Gonsales* "was written by Godwin, according to Anthony Wood, while he was a student at Oxford. By some internal proofs, it must have been later than 1599, and before the death of Elizabeth in 1603. . . . It was translated into French, and became the model of Cyrano de Bergerac, as he was of Swift. Godwin himself has no prototype, as far as I know, but Lucian. . . . 'The moon,' he observes, 'is covered with a sea, except the parts which seem somewhat darker to us, and are dry

merits consideration in every study of the sources of Cyrano, Swift, etc., in every history of aviation, or inquiry into the effect on literature of the new astronomy, and the use of advanced conceptions of gravitation, and which was of sufficient interest to be published in England in 1638, 1657, 1686, 1700, 1708, 1728, etc.; in France in 1648, 1651, 1654, 1666, 1671, and later; in Germany in 1659 and 1660; and in Holland in 1651, 1666, and 1710.⁶

The first two of the three periods mentioned require no comment other than that Godwin alludes unmistakably to the English-Spanish naval engagement fought off the Isle of Pines in 1596.⁷ The third period is likewise questionable, in part for the reason that it is entirely unsupported by evidence, but primarily because it credits Bishop Godwin with historical information and scientific conceptions unknown at that time. On the basis of the relative modernity of these conceptions, biographical data, and other evidence which it was my good fortune to meet with recently, the date of composition is unquestionably after 1615, and probably during the years 1627-28.⁸

I

The most important item in this new evidence is the fact that Godwin is indebted to Nicholas Trigault's *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas suscepta ab Societate Jesu* (Augsburg, 1615), or to one of its translations, perhaps the French *Histoire de l'expédition Chrestienne au Royaume de la Chine* (Lyon, 1616).⁹ Described somewhat more accurately, this partial source is one of the early editions of Trigault's redaction of *Dell entrata della Compagnia de Giesu e Cristianità nella*

land.' A contrary hypothesis came afterwards to prevail; but we must not expect everything from our ingenious young student." Godwin became bishop of Llandaff in 1601. Hallam's date is followed by E. Hönncher (*Anglia*, X, 452), Allibone, the *Britannica*, etc.

⁶ The *Gonsales* is a combination of the picaresque, moon voyage, and travel tale, and is the first artistic narrative to employ the new astronomy, advanced conceptions of gravity, and a rational method of aviation. Its publication precedes that of the famous Proposition XIV of Bishop Wilkins' *Discovery*, which is not a part of the first edition of 1638.

⁷ *Anglia*, X, 432.

⁸ Hallam's evidence for his *ante hoc* is probably the request made by Pylonas, provincial governor on the moon, that Gonsales accord him one courtesy—the presenting of his compliments to Queen Elizabeth, the "most glorious" of women ([London, 1638], p. 112). The *post hoc* may be the reference to the moon being two days old on September 11 [1599] (*Anglia*, X, 441).

⁹ A Spanish translation was published in Seville in 1621, and the Latin edition was republished in 1623.

Cina, the manuscript of Father Matthew Ricci, founder of the Peking mission, diplomat and mathematician extraordinary.¹⁰

It will be recalled that one most striking feature of Godwin's art is the skill with which narration is built upon and within a structure of actual historical events.¹¹ This union begins with the opening of the tale, where Domingo in 1568-69 abandons his studies at the University of Salamanca to participate in the conflict then raging intermittently in the Low Countries.¹² Historical contact is continued by the return of Gonsales in 1573 with the Duke of Alva,¹³ by reference to the battle off the Isle of Pines in 1596, by the inclusion of an unidentified and perhaps fictitious minor engagement between other ships of Spain and England,¹⁴ by the request of Pylonas in 1601 that the returning Gonsales give his felicitations to Queen Elizabeth,¹⁵ and, in conclusion, by Domingo's meeting and fraternizing, "many months" later, with the Jesuit Fathers who had entered Peking on January 24, 1601.¹⁶

It is apparent that Godwin's knowledge of the existence of the Jesuit mission founded in 1601 does not of itself indicate indebtedness to the account written by Trigault, and consequently a *post hoc* date of 1615, for this and other items of information could easily have reached England by 1605 or 1606. However, his information and his employment of it are too sure, too precise, and too detailed to have originated in such incomplete and confused bits of gossip as might have drifted slowly back from a land truly far off from England in the first years of the seventeenth century. His narrative indicates organized and accurate information, such as was available only in Trigault, as a comparison will indicate.

After Gonsales had arrived in China upon his return trip from the

¹⁰ Ricci and the Peking mission are mentioned in the Latin and Italian 1615 editions of Trigault's *Litterae Societatis Jesue regno Sinarum, annorum MDCX & XI*, but the contents offer little parallel with the details of the narrative of the *Gonsales*. As much may be said of the letters of Father Pantoia.

¹¹ Dr. David Rubio, consultant in Romance languages at the Library of Congress, has suggested as a possible source for the name of Godwin's hero Domingo Gonsales, or Gundisalvo, Spanish philosopher of the twelfth century, whose translations included works on magic.

¹² *Anglia*, X, 430.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 431; date omitted in this edition.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 435-36.

¹⁵ (London, 1638), p. 112. Crouch, and editions employing his text, omit this passage.

¹⁶ *Anglia*, X, 452.

moon, and had been discovered, pursued, captured, and placed under arrest, Godwin writes:

The substance of this accusation, it seems, was that I was a magician, . . . and that being a stranger, I . . . contrary to the laws of China, had entered the kingdom without a warrant, and probably for no good intent. The mandarin heard them . . . and . . . ordered his servants I should be . . . strictly guarded and kindly used. . . . Thus I continued many months. . . . In this time I learned . . . to speak the language of that province. . . . The strangeness of my story did much amaze him, and finding in all my discourse, nothing tending to magick, wherein he hoped, by my means to be instructed, he began to admire the excellency of my wit. . . . After which the mandarin took so much delight in me, that no day passed wherein he did not send for me. At length he advised me to clothe myself in the habit of that country, which I willingly did, and gave me not only the liberty of his house, but took me also with him when he went to Pequin. . . . By oft frequenting Pequin, I at length heard of some fathers of the society of Jesus, who were become famous for their extraordinary favour with the king, to whom they had presented some European gifts, as clocks, watches, dials, and the like, which by them were counted exquisite curiosities. To these, by the mandarin's leave, I repaired, and was welcomed by them, they much wondering to see a lay Spaniard there, whither they had, with so much difficulty, obtained leave to arrive. There did I relate to Father Pantoja, and others of the society, the forementioned adventures, by whose directions I put them in writing, and sent this story of my fortunes to Macao, from thence to be conveyed to Spain as a forerunner of my return. And, the mandarin being indulgent with me, I came often to the fathers, with whom I consulted about many secrets, and with them also, laid the foundation of my return.¹⁷

A few of the incidents excepted, the details of this description are noticeably similar, in part or in whole, to those of various sections of Trigault. The rector of the College of Macao was arrested, and "il fut decelé au gouverneur, d'autant qu'estant homme estranger Il estoit entré au Royaume de la Chine sans aucune permission des Magistrats. Il est donc pris, & retenu quelque jours," after which he was released by the aid of a friendly magistrate, or mandarin, at Macao.¹⁸ The first wish of the patron of Gonsales was to be instructed in magic, and in Trigault, the son of a magistrate who came to the Fathers, and through whom "Les nostres cōtractent amitié avec des principaus Magistrats,"¹⁹ retained, after some time spent with the Fathers, "son principal dessein, encore que du commencement il le tint fort secret,

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 450 ff.

¹⁸ *Histoire*, Livre IV, chap. v, p. 436.

Ibid., Livre III, chap. iii, p. 422.

tendoit à l'Alchimie."²⁰ In addition, "les nostres pour ne donner quelque ombrage de suspçon aux Chinois ... apprendre le langage naturel de ce païs ... et se vestoient de l'habit aussi que entre les Chinois est tenu pour le plus modeste."²¹

As is stated in Godwin's brief summary, Father Ricci and his companions gained unusual favor with the "king," Wan-li, to whom they brought such gifts as clocks, watches, sundials, and maps;²² and they had, indeed, a most difficult time gaining entrance into China, being admitted and deported time after time, but always arranging by some means to obtain a new foothold when it became necessary.²³ There is in addition an external similarity between the narrative of Trigault and that of Gonsales, which, as Godwin states above, was written at the "directions" of the Fathers, first sent to Macao, the headquarters, and "tombeau commun de le Compagnie,"²⁴ and later to Spain as a forerunner of his return. The *Memoirs* of Father Ricci went to Macao, then to Rome, where they were translated and edited at the request of those of authority in the Society, and were published as an envoy in Europe.²⁵ Of the two last partial similarities, Trigault writes:

Cependant les affaires de ceste mission Chrestienne le requerant, il sembla qu'il estoit necessaire d'envoyer un Procureur en Europe. A quoi ayant esté denomé par l'autorite des superieurs, i'ay entierement creu que ie devois derechef lire les Commentaires manuscrits du P. Mathieu Riccius & les traduire en Latin.²⁶

There occurs further adaptation from the *Histoire* in the incident where Gonsales is summoned by Irdonozur (ruler of the moon) to his court, but is neither admitted to his presence nor permitted to see him. By some unexplained means Irdonozur does see Gonsales, although remaining invisible to him. The two converse through a window.²⁷ In the account of Trigault, Father Ricci and his associates are summoned by Vanlie (Wan-li) to his court, and are not permitted to see him. The emperor obtains the portraits of the Fathers and con-

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 419.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Livre II, chap. v, pp. 277 and 278.

²² *Ibid.*, Livre IV, chap. iii, pp. 678 ff. Specific reference to the clocks, etc., is made on p. 685.

²³ See esp. Livre II, chaps. iii and xiv, and Livre III, chap. i, or pp. 240 ff.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1096.

²⁵ While at Peking, Father Trigault (Preface) translated Father Ricci's Italian manuscript into Portuguese—a precaution against its loss.

²⁶ Préface au Lecteur.

²⁷ *Anglia*, X, 446.

verses with them through messengers.²⁸ Gonsales remains at the court of Irdonozur "above a quarter of a moon,"²⁹ shortly more than a week, and the conferences or exchanges between Father Ricci and Wan-li continue "trois iours & plusieurs autres apres."³⁰ Such relationships are too close to be pure coincidence, as is also true of the combination of two other events: the birth of Father Ricci and of Gonsales in the same year (1552) and the writing of the biography of each in close contact with the Peking mission.³¹ Nor is Godwin's Father Pantoja a legendary character, but "Jacques Pantoia ... procureur des affaires" of the mission, the principal figure in obtaining a tomb for Father Ricci and a church for his associates, and the Father whose name appears most frequently in the final portions of the *Histoire*.³²

It is apparent, I believe, that Godwin was well acquainted with the *Histoire* of Trigault, and that, since he could not have read it until 1615, the earliest *post hoc* of the *Gonsales* is definitely this year.³³ It is also probable that composition would have been difficult before 1618, for in 1615 Godwin published a revision of the *Catalogue of the bishops of England*, augmented by the addition of the *Annals of the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary*.³⁴ He translated this extensive work into Latin in the following year, and in 1617 became bishop of Hereford, where he was engaged until December 20 in obtaining restoration of the temporalities.

II

The second major argument in support of the hypothesis that the *Gonsales* belongs to the period of 1620 rather than to that of 1600 is based on the relative modernity of six scientific or pseudoscientific conceptions advanced by Godwin. Two, and perhaps four, of these theories had become by 1615 commonplaces to those acquainted with advanced physical and cosmological speculation; but, considered together, they represent a body of information not expressed by any

²⁸ *Histoire*, pp. 684 ff.

²⁹ *Anglia*, X, 446.

³⁰ *Histoire*, pp. 684 ff.

³¹ Préface au Lecteur; and *Gonsales* (London, 1638), p. 1; *Anglia*, X, 452.

³² *Histoire*, pp. 1049 ff.

³³ According to the Preface, the translation was completed January, 1615. I have no information as to the month of publication.

³⁴ *DNB*, art. "Godwin, Francis."

known writer, scientist or layman, until after 1620. According to these conceptions:

1. The surface of the moon contains small irregularities or spots which are not visible from the earth.³⁵
2. The diurnal rotation of the earth may be demonstrated by observing the movement of its larger spots or continents from a point in space.³⁶
3. Heavy bodies do not fall to the center of the earth as their natural place, but are drawn by a secret property which operates in a manner similar to that of a loadstone attracting iron.³⁷
4. This secret property, or attraction, is found on the moon as well as on the earth.³⁸
5. The attraction of the larger earth is greater than that of the smaller moon.³⁹
6. Attraction varies with distance as well as with mass or size. A lunar who jumped fifty or sixty feet on the moon would then by wings move horizontally without being drawn to his earth.⁴⁰

The conception of the surface of the moon given in the *Gonsales* is post-telescopic, as is indicated by a comparison of descriptions, in this order, drawn from Plutarch and Lucian—in this respect the most modern of those writing prior to 1609—from Galileo in 1610, and from Godwin.⁴¹

The projections of the bright parts upon the darkened, assuming the form of elevations and depressions, arrange in a most natural manner the features that appear around the eyes and lips: . . . They give the moon a black eye, by thus covering her face with spots and dark patches, at one and the same time proclaiming her *Artemis* and *Athene*, and then making her out a composition and mass of dusky air and coaly fire, not possessing any kindling spark or light of her own.⁴²

We reached it [the moon], cast anchor, and landed; inspection soon showed it was inhabited and cultivated. In the daytime nothing could be discerned

³⁵ *Anglia*, X, 441.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 438.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 441 and 450.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 439–40.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 441, 444, 450.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 444 and 450.

⁴¹ An example of the quickness and strength of the reaction which followed the telescope's evidence as to the nature of the moon is *De phaenomenis in orbe lunae* (Venetis, 1612). Important observations, in addition to those of Galileo, were made by Scheiner, Mayer, Harriot, and Fabricius. Among modern studies in the field are sections in Grant, *Physical astronomy*; Stephens, *Thomas Harriot*; and Fahie, *Galileo*.

⁴² "The face in the orb of the moon," *Plutarch's complete works, essays and miscellanies*, I, 531 ff. The theory first discussed is that the light from the moon's brighter portion is a reflection from the earth's "ocean." Plutarch believes in hills and valleys on the moon.

outside it; but night revealed many neighbouring islands, some larger and some smaller than ours.⁴³

Of the surface of the Moon . . . I distinguish two parts . . . which I call respectively the brighter and the darker. The brighter part seems to surround and pervade the whole hemisphere; but the darker part, like a sort of cloud, discolours the Moon's surface and makes it appear covered with spots. Now these spots, as they are somewhat dark and of considerable size, are plain to every one, and every one and every age has seen them, wherefore I shall call them *great* or *ancient* spots, to distinguish them from other spots, smaller in size, but so thickly scattered that they sprinkle the whole surface of the Moon, but especially the brighter portion of it.⁴⁴

I then perceived also, that this world [the moon, which Gonsales and his gansas are approaching] was the greatest part covered with a huge mighty sea, those parts being dry land, which are to us somewhat darker than the rest of her body, I mean, what the people call, The Man in the Moon; and that part, which shines so bright, is another ocean, besprinkled with islands, which for their smallness, we cannot discern so far off.⁴⁵

In Plutarch we have "spots and dark patches"; in Lucian, "islands, some larger and some smaller"; but in Godwin, small spots within the larger, brighter portion. These "islands," which Gonsales says "we cannot discern so far off," are the new spots which Galileo discovered and correctly describes as having "never been observed by any one before me."⁴⁶ The ease with which Godwin adapts this observation to his narrative suggests the familiar rather than the newly discovered, and indicates that the conception had some general acceptance among the informed.

The second of the theories applies to the earth that type of logic which Galileo moved toward in his *Discussion on floating bodies*, and reached shortly thereafter in his letters of May 12 and 25, 1612, to Prince Cesi, wherein the rotation of the sun and Jupiter is demonstrated by the movement of their spots. The first published application of this technique or principle in England is that of Marke Ridley, who supports the theory of the diurnal rotation of the earth by pointing out the revolution of the sun and Jupiter, as demonstrated by the movement of their spots. Ridley continues by stating that the rotation of the earth might be proved in like manner, "but how the Earth doth turne circularly we cannot well see it, with the sence of our eyes,

⁴³ *The works of Lucian*, trans. H. W. and F. G. Fowler (4 vols.; Oxford, 1905), II, 140

⁴⁴ *The sidereal messenger*, trans. E. S. Carlos (London, 1880), p. 15.

Anglia, X, 441.

⁴⁵ *The sidereal messenger*, p. 15.

unlesse we had them placed in another globous body or starre, as if they were in the Moone."⁴⁷ In Godwin's treatment of this theme, which Ridley presents in 1613, we again find an ease and deftness scarcely suggestive of pioneer expression.

The conceptions that bodies are drawn to the earth by a secret property, and that a similar property, or attraction, exists on the moon, roughly parallel those of Copernicus, whose general conception of universal gravitation remained the most modern until Foscarinus and Kepler. Godwin refers to a secret property, Copernicus to an appetite; both extend attraction beyond the one globe of the earth.⁴⁸ The thinking of Copernicus, however, seems to include the belief that this attraction is occasioned by a universal appetite to form a perfect sphere, the absence of which in Godwin's thought gives him a conception somewhat more modern.⁴⁹ The author of the *Gonsales* is definitely more advanced than the Gilbert of *The magnet*, where one finds in one instance, "parts betaking themselves to their origins and founts," with "heavy bodies . . . united to earth by their heaviness," and in another, "effluences . . . [which] cohere through continuity of substance," and a force which prevents bodies in the air being affected by the diurnal rotation of the earth.⁵⁰ Gilbert specifically attributes gravity to the moon and to the sun, but this is a gravity whereby "parts are attached with the same appetence, with which what we call heavy bodies are attached to earth," and he states that "lunar bodies tend to the moon, solar to the sun." The statements of these two points by Kepler in *Astronomia nova* (1609)⁵¹ and Foscarinus in *Epistola ad Sebastianum Fantonum* (1615),⁵² although more specific and detailed, follow basically those advanced by Copernicus. Kepler implies, but does not state, that the attraction of the earth is greater than that of the moon,⁵³ and Foscarinus gives the earliest printed statement of Godwin's discovery that bodies have of themselves no

⁴⁷ *A short treatise of magneticall bodies and motions* (London, 1613), p. 15. Ridley accepts the theory of the essential similarity of the globes of the universe, and is one of the first to attempt to develop a scientific hypothesis explanatory of their relative stability.

⁴⁸ *De revolutionibus*, I, viii.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, I, i and ii.

⁵⁰ All references within this paragraph are to *The magnet*, VI, v. The primary interest in this book as well as chapter is not in gravity but in the diurnal motion of the earth.

⁵¹ Introduction, *Opera omnia* (Frankofurti, MDCCCLX), III, 150-51.

⁵² In *Galilaei Galilaei, Systema cosmicum* (Lugduni Batavorum, 1699), pp. 476 ff.

⁵³ III, 151.

manner of weight,⁵⁴ writing, "nihil est Gravititas."⁵⁵ This statement, however, apparently was not generally available during Godwin's lifetime.⁵⁶

The two last of Godwin's conceptions could have been developed by him from the brief statement in *De revolutionibus*, but are stated neither there nor in the works of Gilbert, Kepler, and Foscarinus mentioned above, the first specific written statement apparently being that in *De mundo nostro sublunari philosophia nova*, printed posthumously in 1651.⁵⁷ Gilbert's interpretation, which lacks Godwin's theme of variation with distance, is in part:

The force which emanates from the moon reaches to the earth, and, in like manner, the magnetic virtue of the earth pervades the region of the moon: both correspond and conspire by the joint action of both, according to a proportion and conformity of motions, but the earth has more effect in consequence of its superior mass.⁵⁸

A second posthumous statement is that of Kepler in the *Notae in somnium astronomicum* (1634), where the sixty-sixth note progresses beyond the foundation laid by Copernicus, and improved in the *Astronomia nova*: "Gravitatem ego definio virtute magneticae simili, attractionis mutuae. Huius vero attractionis major vis est in corporibus inter se vicinus quam in remotis. Fortius igitur resistent divulsioni unius ab altero, cum adhuc vicina invicem."⁵⁹ This conception, developed between 1620 and 1630, when the *Notae* are thought to have been written, presents, in combination with Kepler's earlier implication that gravity varies with mass, an interpretation which is near to, if it is not the final philosophic conception awaiting mathematics to render it complete. It is more advanced than the interpretation of Godwin.

⁵⁴ *Anglia*, X, 438.

⁵⁵ P. 477.

⁵⁶ The *Imprimatur* of the *Epistola* is dated 1630, but I have found no important publication earlier than 1635, the first edition of the *Systema cosmicum*.

⁵⁷ It is possible, but doubtful, that Godwin knew of this treatise or could have been as conversant with it as he apparently is with *The magnet*, to a principal theme of which (I, xvii; VI, i) he alludes (*Anglia*, X, 441), where he mentions "that tyrannous lodestone, the earth." His major argument in support of the diurnal rotation of the earth (p. 440) resembles that reiterated by Gilbert (VI, iii and vi).

⁵⁸ As cited by Whewell, *History of the inductive sciences* (New York, 1858), I, 394.

⁵⁹ VIII, 47. I discuss Godwin's apparent acquaintance with the text of the *Somnium*, which circulated in manuscript after 1609, in the edition of *The man in the moone* and *Nuncius inanimatus*, "Smith College Studies in Modern Languages," Vol. XIX, No. 1.

The third posthumous statement, perhaps the last written but the first to be published, occurs in the *Sylva sylvarum* (1626), where Bacon maintains:

It is very probable that the *Motion of Gravity* worketh weakly, both farre from the Earth, and also within the Earth: The former, because of the Appetite of Union of Dense Bodies with the Earth, in respect of the distance, is more dull; The later, because the Body hath in part attained his Nature, when it is some Depth in the Earth. For as for the moving to a *Point* or place (which was the Opinion of the Ancients) it is a meere Vanity.⁶⁰

In comparison with the interpretations advanced by these pioneers in the field of attraction, the conception of gravity presented by Godwin is slightly inferior to that drawn from the several statements by Kepler, the last of which, published in 1634, was written between 1620 and 1630, and is more complete than the statement by Gilbert, published in 1651, written before 1603, and that made by Bacon, published in 1626 and apparently composed about 1625. Of these several publications, with the exception of the *Astronomia nova*, which largely follows Copernicus, the one available to Godwin was the *Sylva sylvarum*, and it is perhaps more than coincidence that the theory advanced here by Bacon is that most extensively employed in the *Gonsales*. So we find Domingo's gansas panting and gasping for breath when they have brought themselves and their burden to the top of the Pike (El Piton); then, after flying less laboriously for an hour, they move with no difficulty for some time, and at length progress without effort.⁶¹ The Lunars of the moon conquer the less powerful attraction there by jumping fifty or sixty feet into the air, and then travel easily, by the aid of fans, wherever they wish.⁶² Domingo himself, in company with sixty others, was carried through this "stratosphere" five leagues, fifteen to twenty miles, in two hours. As he returns from the moon, the force of gravity grows so powerful on the last of the nine days of the trip that only his use of the Ebelus enables the gansas, now twenty-two instead of twenty-five, to lower him safely to the earth.⁶³ These incidents are applications of the

⁶⁰ (London, 1628), pp. 11-12. William Rowley states in "To the reader" that the work had been prepared for publication prior to the death of Bacon.

⁶¹ *Anglia*, X, 437.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 444.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 450. The Ebelus was one of the magic stones presented Gonsales by Pylonas, provincial governor on the moon. It had the effect of lightening the one possessing it.

principle which Bacon states as gravity working "weakly . . . farre from the earth," available to Godwin in either the 1626, 1627, 1628, or later editions of this popular work. However, the principle may have been developed by the bishop, in which case the comparative date for his more complete interpretation would be about the middle of the third decade, or 1625.

III

The first of the two last items of internal evidence applicable to the date of the *Gonsales* occurs in that section of the story where Domingo develops his device for flying, and carefully trains each gansa to carry a relatively heavy object. Here again is thinking similar to that in an "experiment" set forth in the *Sylva sylvarum*:

It is reported that amongst the *Leucadians*, in *Ancient* time, upon a Superstition, they did use to Precipitate a *Man*, from a *High Cliffe* into the *Sea*; Tying about him with Strings, at some distance, many great *Fowles*; And fixing unto his *Body* divers *Feathers*, spred to breake the *Fall*; Certainly many *Birds* of good *Wing*, (as *Kites*, and the like) would beare up a good *Weight* as they flie; And *spreading* of *Feathers*, thin and close, and in great *Bredth*, will likewise beare up a great *Weight*; Being even laid, without *Tilting* upon the *Sides*. The further *Extension* of this *Experiment* for *Flying* may be thought upon.⁶⁴

In the tale of Godwin, the first flight of Domingo and the gansas is made from the "top of a rock at the river's mouth,"⁶⁵ and the second from the "top of the deck" of a ship,⁶⁶ so that there are present in both instances height and the sea. Domingo is carried at a distance by twenty-five gansas, each of which is attached by means of a "string." These gansas are large fowl, with one foot that of the eagle, the other that of the swan, and are birds of prey, as is the Kite.⁶⁷

There is no question but that Godwin employs here the device which Bacon describes, making, it would seem, a very perfect extension of this experiment. To be sure, he may not have drawn it from Bacon but from another and possibly the original source—the *Geography* of Strabo, wherein the author says, after describing the leap of Sappho and others from the rock Leucatas:

⁶⁴ Century IX, 886; (London, 1628), p. 227.

⁶⁵ *Anglia*, X, 434.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 436.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 434-35.

It was an ancestral custom among the Leucadians, every year at the sacrifice performed in honour of Apollo, for some criminal to be flung from this rocky lookout for the sake of averting evil, wings and birds of all kinds being fastened to him, since by their fluttering they could lighten the leap, and also for a number of men, stationed all round below the rock in small fishing-boats, to take the victim in, and, when he had been taken on board, to do all in their power to get him safely outside their borders.⁶⁸

However, there is not present in this legend any suggestion of great birds tied at some distance with string, and, of greater importance, the theme is that of a partially broken fall in contrast with the bearing-up of a good weight, a vital addition which Bacon makes. In addition, the *Daedalus* of Bishop Wilkins, the most comprehensive history of attempts at flight published during the first half of the century, neither mentions nor considers any source other than Bacon for this "experiment."⁶⁹ Such a citation by the Bishop is of definite importance, for he was not only an exacting investigator given to quotation and mention of original sources wherever these could be found, and of multiple sources if these were known, but was also the best-informed man in this field until some years after 1650. His failure to mention any source other than the *Sylva sylvarum* is, I believe, good evidence that the account of Strabo was unknown to him and, probably, unknown to Godwin.⁷⁰ The two bishops apparently employed the one source, in which is presented the theory of attraction as varying with distance to which Godwin gives so much place in his narrative. If one may trust the preponderance of available evidence, the *Gonsales* obtained suggestions from the *Sylva*, and the *post hoc* date of Godwin's romance is not earlier than July 4, 1626, when the *Sylvarum* was entered.

The *ante hoc* date of the work is definitely 1629, since in that year the *Nuncius inanimatus*, unpublished when the *Gonsales* was written, was printed anonymously.⁷¹ This date sets the apparent limits of the romance as 1626-29, with the probable years of composition 1627-28.

⁶⁸ *The geography of Strabo*, trans. Horace Leonard Jones ("Loeb Classical Library"), V, 33-35.

⁶⁹ *Mathematicall magick* (London, 1648). He, of course, mentions Godwin, just preceding Bacon.

⁷⁰ The *STC* lists no editions of Strabo. Principal Continental editions were 1516, 1587, and 1620.

⁷¹ *Anglia*, X, 432.

This date permits the author to assert truthfully that he was the first to discover the nature of weight or attraction, despite the existence in manuscript of probably earlier conceptions.⁷² It places the *Gonsales* well after the publication of the *Histoire* of Trigault and within the decade when hypotheses similar to Godwin's scientific conceptions were being advanced and formulated by other thinkers. It makes available in the *Sylva sylvarum* an idea and a device each basic in the *Gonsales*, and, equally important, it provides time essential to the mutation of philosophic speculation into artistic expression. The evidence leading to the probable *post hoc* date is often more subjective than one would wish; but in the complete absence of contradictory information it supports adequately the conclusion that the *Domingo Gonsales*, definitely written after 1615, was probably composed during 1627-28.

SMITH COLLEGE

⁷² The author's literary use of attraction and of a comprehensible and rational device for flight remains pioneer, regardless of the question of priority in theory.

THE DIARY OF A CAROLINE THEATERGOER

GERALD EADES BENTLEY

ONE of the most promising sources of information about Elizabethan theatrical history is the private diaries and letters which have survived the housecleaning raids of three centuries. A number have been published in whole or in part, but it is probable that a great many remain to be examined for the information and interest they can add to our knowledge of dramatic history. The diary and account book of Sir Humphrey Mildmay, from which the following extracts are taken, give us a valuable record of the London theater in the reign of Charles I. So far as I know, it is the most complete account of any individual's theater attendance which exists for the Elizabethan period.

The manuscript, which is preserved in the British Museum (Harl. MS 454), is a large book, $11\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{8}$ inches. The diary occupies the front portion and consists of 104 leaves covering the period from July 3, 1633, to July 9, 1652; the accounts, which are entered in the back of the same manuscript book reversed, consist of 75 leaves covering the period from January 21, 1631/32, to July 22, 1652. Both diary and accounts are so closely written that they are sometimes difficult to decipher, though the hand is not a bad one. In his history of the family (*A brief memoir of the Mildmay family* [London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1913]) Lieutenant Colonel Herbert A. St. John Mildmay says that a copy of this diary was sold at Sotheby's on July 10, 1857, and is probably the one which is now the property of Mr. Humphrey St. John-Mildmay, of Shoreham, Kent. The second part of Sir Humphrey Mildmay's diary, from July 11, 1652, to June 2, 1666, is now among the papers of the Marquis of Ormond at Kilkenny Castle.

Sir Humphrey Mildmay (1592-?1666) was the oldest surviving son of Sir Anthony Mildmay, of Danbury, Essex, and the grandson of Sir Walter Mildmay, of Apethorpe, Northamptonshire, Chancellor of the Exchequer to Queen Elizabeth. His younger brother, Sir Henry Mildmay, was the Master of the Jewel House under Charles I who deserted the royalists in 1641 and was imprisoned as a regicide in

1660. Another brother, Anthony, who is frequently mentioned in the diary and who seems to have been Sir Humphrey's boon companion, was a sewer at the court of Charles I, later one of the four gentlemen in attendance on the king in the last months of his life, and, after the execution, custodian of the royal children at Carisbrook (see the *DNB* accounts of Sir Walter and Sir Henry Mildmay, Lieutenant Colonel Mildmay's *Memoir*, and the *Visitations of Essex*).

Sir Humphrey himself was less active in public affairs than his two brothers. He seems to have concerned himself chiefly with the management of his estates and the social pleasures of London, dividing his time between London and Danbury, in Essex, with occasional visits to his estate at Queen Camel, Somerset.

The diary, which gives a short account of from one to five lines of nearly every day Sir Humphrey spent in London and of many of those he spent in the country, is generally little more than a bare relation of activities. It gives ample evidence, however, that the author was a regular patron of the theaters, since he recorded about six visits a year in the ten years between the opening of the account book in January, 1631/32, and the closing of the theaters at the beginning of the Civil War. Whenever there is a lapse of two months or more in the records of dramatic entertainment, it is almost invariably accounted for by Sir Humphrey's absence from London or by some temporary prohibition of acting. It is unfortunate that his theatrical items are not more explicit.

So far as I know, most of these extracts from Sir Humphrey's diary have never been published before. Collier noticed about one-third of them (*HEDP*, Vols. I and II, *passim*), but since this is just the sort of material with which Collier is most suspected, not much use has been made of his extracts. There is, however, no evidence that Collier tampered with the manuscript except, perhaps, in one place. On May 30, 1633, Sir Humphrey recorded (fol. 180) a payment for spurs to "M^r Shakespere his man." A modern hand, slightly disguised, has written in the margin opposite, "No Player now." Since Collier inserted a short speculation as to the meaning of "these remarkable words" in the first edition of his *History of English dramatic poetry* (II, 42 n.), one suspects that he wrote the marginal note himself. Though his other extracts are not altogether accurate and a few are complete misreadings (such as "Dorcrutch" for "Bor Anth" in the accounts for

June 8, 1633, and "Com. Panheard" for "Company eod" in those for January 27, 1633/34; see *HEDP*, I, 482 n. and 489 n.), they are not fabrications.

I have taken all references to plays, masques, or theaters from the beginning of the diary and accounts through the year 1643. Other references to purchases of books, political and social events, or merely amusing activities I have ignored unless they seemed to have some bearing on the play records, though in one or two instances the temptation to quote has proved too much for me.

The entries are given in chronological order; the record from the account book is listed first and marked "A," followed by the entry from the diary, marked "D." Occasionally there is the record of a play in the diary with no corresponding record in the accounts, or vice versa. Since the diary does not begin until some eighteen months after the beginning of the account book, the first dozen or so entries from the accounts stand alone.

- 1631/32, Jan. 26 or 27. A, 183^v. "To a play wth Sr fra:
 Wortely. 00-02-06"
 1632, June 25. A, 182^v. "To Marke Waxe, ets & a playe
 eod. 00-03-00"
 1632, Nov. 17. A, 181^v. "To a play = 17. 00-01-06"
 1632, Nov. 30. A, 181^v. "To a playe ets [?] the laste A. . 00-04-00"
 1632, Dec. 19-22. A, 181. "Expences att a playe wth my
 wyfe. 00-07-06"
 1632/33, Jan. 16. A, 181. "To a play eod. 00-01-00"
 1632/33, Jan. 22. A, 181. "To a play att the bla: ffryers
 = 22. 00-01-00"
 1633, May 14. A, 180. "To a playe eod. 00-02-00"
 1633, May 16. A, 180. "To a play that day beinge Thurs-
 day att the globe. 00-02-00"
 1633, May 23. A, 180. "To a play Called Rolloe, & the
 globe: 23. 00-01-06"
 (Fletcher's *Rolloe, Duke of Normandy or the bloody
 brother.*)
 1633, June 6. A, 179^v. "To a pretty & Merry Conedy att
 the Cocke. 00-01-00"
 (The Phoenix, or Cockpit, in Drury Lane.)

- 1633, June 8-10. A, 179^v. "To a playe att the globe, wth
 Bor [?] Anth. 00-01-06"
- 1633, July 18. A, 179. "To a playe att the globe this 18th 00-01-10"
- 1633/34, Jan. 14. A, 178^v. "To M^r and my selfe att a play:
 14. 00-03-00"
- 1633/34, Jan. 21. A, 178. "To a playe att Bla: fryers
 eod. 00-01-06"
 D, 5^v. "21: Ja: warde was hanged att grayes Inn lane,
 eande, & one att longe lane eande for a foule rape|" (Apparently the criminal news drove the play from Sir
 Humphrey's mind.)
- 1633/34, Jan. 22. A, 178. "To a playe att the fryers, the
 Witts. 00-01-00"
 D, 5^v. "22: att a playe att the bl = fryers." (The play
 is D'Avenant's; Sir Henry Herbert had licensed it only
 three days before. The entry in the accounts is undated,
 but its position between entries for January 21 and
 January 23, together with the diary entry, makes the
 date clear.)
- 1633/34, Jan. 27. A, 178. "To a playe wth Company eod. . 00-03-00"
 D, 5^v. ". . . this day I was att the Newe play et"
- 1633/34, Feb. 3. A, 178. "To a Coachman that day. . . 00-01-00"
 D, 5^v. "att nighte in the strande, att the lodgeinge of
 Mons^r: Bobarre where wee supped, & sawe the stately
 Masque" (The masque performed this night was
 Shirley's *Triumph of peace*.)
- 1633-34, Feb. 6. A, 178. "for a boate, to Whitehall: eod. 00-00-06
 "To a barbir for my bearde ets. 00-01-06
 "For a booke & the play of pastorell [?]. 00-02-00"
 D, 5^v. ". . . this nighte I was att Whitehall att the
 daunceinge & playe, & laye all nighte wth Bor Anth:"
 (The dates are uncertain here, but both accounts and
 diary entries seem to belong to February 6. The play
 at court this night was Shirley's *Gamester*.)
- 1633/34, Feb. 7. A, 178. (Nothing of plays in this day's
 accounts.)
 D, 5^v. "I came home to dynner, wente to the bl = fry-
 ers wth M^r Prince. . . ."

- 1633/34, Feb. 13. A, 178. "To a Middwife & a Nurse to Ben: Wallinger his Childe this: 13th of feb. 00-12-00"
 D, 5^v. ". . . this nighte was againe the famous Masque before there Ma^{rs}: att Marchant Taylers hall in London" (This was the second performance of Shirley's *Triumph of peace*.)
- 1633/34, Feb. 18. A, 178. "for the Masque of his Ma eod . . 00-00-06"
 D, 5^v. ". . . att nighte was pformed his Ma^{rs}: Masque of Lordes et att Whitehall" (The masque was Carew's *Coelum Britannicum*.)
- 1633/34, Mar. 20. A, 177^v. "To a base play att the Cocke pitt eod. 00-01-06"
 D, 6. ". . . this after noone J wente to the Cocke pitt to a playe wth Bor Anth: a fooleishe one"
- 1634, May 1. A, 176^v. "To a Newe play Called the spartan Lady: 1. 00-01-03"
 D, 6^v. ". . . after dynner att a play alone" (This play, by Lodowick Carlell, is not extant. It was entered in the Stationers' Register, September 4, 1646. Sir Humphrey's record gives us the date of the play, since he calls it new.)
- 1634, May 8. A, 176^v. "To a play wth Bor Ch: Abdy: 8. . 00-01-00"
 D, 6^v. ". . . this day dined My Brother Abdy wth mee, & then wee wente to the playe together|"
- 1634, May 21. A, 176^v. "To a playe wth Company: 21. . 00-06-00"
 D, 7. ". . . after dynner wth S^r Henry Skipwith My wife, Ned: Boteler, Nann: Mildmay att the play Called Lasander & Callista, beinge a poem|" (This play was probably *The lovers' progress*, in which Lisander and Calista are the leading characters. Several scholars think it had been revised as *The wandering lovers*, licensed to the King's men, December 6, 1623. Mildmay's title may indicate the one used on the playbills for this performance, or it may indicate his familiarity with the French romance of the same name on which the play was based.)
- 1634, Nov. 9. A. (There is no entry in the accounts for the ninth.)

- D, 8. "... att nighte to the Courte wth a freinde to see Catteline Acted|" (This performance of Jonson's play is first recorded here. Perhaps the court performance led to the second edition of 1635.)
- 1634, Nov. 29. A, 175^v. "To a play after dynner wth D^r Doriela: 29..... 00-04-00"
- D, 8^v. "... att dynner An^{this}: Croftes Ser: Ma: Wentworth from thence to a playe a fine one|"
- 1634, Dec. 12. A, 175. "To a play wth the :2: Southlandes: 12..... 00-04-06"
- D, 8^v. "To a play of Loue & honnor wth the :2: Southlandes...." (D'Avenant's tragi-comedy, which had been licensed to the King's men three weeks before, on the twentieth of November. Mildmay evidently saw the play at the Blackfriars.)
- 1634, Dec. 29. A. (No entry.)
- D, 9. "... This nighte Dame Sisly Croftes Supped heere wth her sweete harte M^r Tho: Killigraue |...."
- 1634/35, Feb. 14. A. (No entry.)
- D, 9^v. "beinge S^t Vallentine was a wett day, att nighte wee both of vs wayted onn My Lady Cooke to a pretty Masque of Ladyes," (In the margin is written, "The Masque." This masque was probably D'Avenant's *The temple of love*, which was first presented by the Queen and her ladies on Shrove Tuesday, but the Venetian ambassador wrote that it was repeated three times.)
- 1634/35, Feb. 19. A, 174^v. "To Expences Jn wine ets: 19..... 00-03-00"
- D, 9^v. "att home vntill dynn^r To a play, & to Supper came good Company Jn plenty."
- 1635, Apr. 25. A, 173^v. "To a playe eod: Called the Elder Brother..... 00-01-00"
- D, 10^v. "... after dynner to the Elder Brother att the bla: ffryers & was idle|" (Fletcher's play, which had probably been revised by Massinger [E. H. C. Oliphant, *The plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, pp. 230-34]. It was presented at court in the following Christmas season.)

- 1635, Apr. 28. A, 173^v. "Expended att the bla: fryers—
28..... 00-03-00"
D, 10^v. "... this after Noone, J spente att a playe
wth good Company."
- 1635, May 6. A, 173^v. "To other Expenses: 5: 6: 7: 8:
et: 9..... 00-07-02"
D, 10^v. "not farre from home all day att the bla: ffryers
& a play this day Called the More of Venice|" (Shake-
speare's *Othello*. It was presented at court December 6,
1636.)
- 1635, Nov. 25. A. (No entry in the accounts for the twen-
ty-fifth.)
D, 12^v. "... after dynner to a fooleishe play att the
fryers,|"
- 1635, Nov. 27. A, 172^v. "To a playe wth D^r Doriila: 27.. 00-03-00"
D, 12^v. "... the after Noone J spente wth the D^r att
a playe & came home Jn peace|"
- 1635, Dec. 8. A, 172. "To the playe Called the La: of
pleasure..... 00-01-00"
D, 13. "... dined wth Rob: Dowgill wente to the La:
of pleasure & sawe that rare playe came home late
Supped" (Shirley's comedy. It had been licensed
two months before. Since it was printed two years later
as a Queen's men's play, Mildmay must have seen it at
the Cockpit. The account-book entry is not dated, but it
occurs between the items for the sixth and the tenth,
and the diary shows that it belongs to the eighth.)
- 1635, Dec. 11. A. (No entry in the accounts for the
eleventh.)
D, 13. "To dynner came S^r Chr: Abdy & wente to the
Newe playe wth my wife J wente abroad by myselfe to
worse places alone|"
- 1635, Dec. 16. A, 172. "To a playe att bla: fryers wth
good Company..... 00-03-06"
D. (No diary entries from December 14 to December 20.)
- 1637, Nov. 3. A, 169. "To my Exp: att the play ets: 3.. 00-02-06"
D, 18^v. "... dined att home & wento the fryers blacke
to a play & home to Supper & bed in Peace|"

1637/38, Feb. 3. A, 168^v. "Espenses att White hall ets. . 00-05-00"

D, 20. "a Sad durty wett & windy Morneinge| I wente to Westmi. by water & dined wth m^r Layton & Came home by Ned: Herris et wth Ben: Wallinger J have beine all soe & Scene a sawsie Accoumpte| To White hall I wente Supped wth M^r Secretary Cooke & Came home durty & weary| the playe beinge full."

1637/38, Feb. 5. A, 168^v. "Expences in botehire & the play: 5..... 00-02-06"

D, 20. "dined wth D^r Doriela, Wente & sawe the fool-eishe Newe play . . ."

1638, Oct. 27. A, 167^v. "To see the foxe playe wth fra: Wortley..... 00-04-06"

D, 21^v. "fayre & Cleere all this day I wente to Westmi: dined att Whitehall & after dynner to the fox playe = att bl: fryers wth my Cozen fra. Wortley & my Brother Anth.; & Came Jn Peace to Supper & bedd, I bles god." (Jonson's *Volpone*, generally called by its subtitle in this time. It was acted at court two months later. The account-book entry is undated. It stands between entries for October 26 and November 3. The diary shows that it should be dated October 27.)

1638/39, Feb. 12. A, 167. "To a playe & after supper eod..... 00-05-00"

D, 22^v. "... To a play wth m^{rs} James, & to supper wth D^r Doriela & Tho: Chichley & home."

1638-39, Feb. 13. A. (Nothing about plays in the accounts.)

D, 22^v. "... then I wente to a playe wth D^r Doriela & home late."

1638/39, Feb. 14. A. (Nothing about plays in the accounts.)

D, 22^v. "... after Noone I wente to a playe & was soe Jmployed that day."

1638/39, Feb. 18. A, 166^v. "To him att the playe Jn full 00-06-00"

D, 23. "... dined wth M^{rs} James & wente to a playe wth her. . . ." (The accounts entry is one of several

undated items between February 17 and February 19.

The diary indicates the proper date.)

1639, May 18. A, 166^v. "To the Alchemist eod. 00-05-00"

D, 23^v. ". . . home to dynner| after to a playe wth M^{rs} James & her goodman, a wett day . . ." (The King's men owned Jonson's play. Since this is just about the time that the company usually moved from the Blackfriars to the Globe, it is difficult to tell which theater Mildmay visited.)

1639, May 21. A, 166^v. "To the Mad louer: 21. 00-06-00"

D, 23^v. ". . . after Noone To the playe wth" (Fletcher's play belonged to the King's men. Mildmay probably saw it at the Globe, though the company may still have been at Blackfriars.)

1639, Nov. 8. A, 164. "To a playe: 8. 00-02-00"

D, 27^v. ". . . to dynner from thence wth my Lawer M^r Banfeilde to see a playe . . ."

1639, Nov. 14. A, 164. "To Jone & a playe. 00-02-00"

D, 27^v. ". . . To dynner & then to a playe . . ." (The account entry is undated, between entries for November 8 and November 17. The diary entry indicates that the probable date is November 14.)

1640, May 8. A, 162^v. "Expended att a play 8. 00-03-00"

D, 31^v. ". . . to a playe & loitred all the day . . ."

1640, May 15. A, 162^v. "To the playe house wth my wife & Company. 00-11-00"

D, 31^v. ". . . to dynner & then to the Newe play att Bl: fryers wth my Company where I loste the whole day . . ."

1640, Nov. 6. A, 158. "To Pigge & the Play: 6. 00-02-06"

D, 36^v. ". . . after Noone to a playe all the day ets: . . ." (The Privy Council had ordered all theaters closed because of plague on September 11 in this year. It has not been known heretofore when they were allowed to reopen, but Mildmay's records show that they were functioning at least as early as the sixth of November.)

- 1640, Nov. 9. A, 158. "To a play: 9: wth my Wife & Company that 00-09-00"
 D, 36^v. ". . . . Came home to dynner & founde good Company there after Noone to a playe"
- 1640, Nov. 16. A, 158. "To a Playe wth good Company : 16 00-08-00"
 D, 36^v. ". . . . after Noone wth my wife & Pretty Cozen to a playe & home late"
- 1640/41, Feb. 15. A, 157^v. "To a Playe eod : 15 00-08-06"
 D, 38^v. ". . . . to dynner & soe to the playe & supper wth D^r Doriela & late home to bed"
- 1641, May 18. A. (No record of a play in accounts.)
 D, 40^v. ". . . . to the Hall J wente by boate, to dynner & after I loitered att a playe"
- 1641, May 19 [?]. A, 156^v. "To the play att Blacke fryers 00-01-06"
 D. (No diary record of a play. This accounts entry is undated and comes between entries dated May 19 and May 20. In spite of this fact one is tempted to think that it refers to the diary account of the eighteenth, for there is only one play record in the accounts and one play record in the diary between the theater entries of February 15, 1640/41, and May 24, 1641.)
- 1641, May 24. A, 156. "To a playe ets 00-01-08"
 D, 40^v. ". . . . after Noone I Loitered att a playe et"
- 1641, Dec. 1. A, 154^v. "To a playe: 1: Decembris 00-02-00"
 D, 46. ". . . . after Noone to a Playe & home to Supper & bed," (This account affords our best evidence of the date of the opening of the theaters after the plague of the summer and autumn of 1641.)
- 1641, Dec. 10. A. (No play expenses in the accounts about this date.)
 D, 46. ". . . . to dynner & after to a play"
- 1643, July 18 (?). A, 148. "To My Expenes att the Danceinge of the Ropes wth: all oure famely 00-03-06"
 D, 60. ". . . . to the Danceinge of the Ropes wth: all oure famely this after Noone" (The entry in the ac-

counts is undated and comes between entries for July 19 and July 20. It must, however, refer to the same occasion as the diary of the eighteenth; the dates in the diary seem more trustworthy, since each separate entry is dated there.)

1643, Aug. 21. A, 147^v. "To a Playe & other foleryes... 00-02-01"
D, 60^v. "... I was att a Playe & home Late to
Sup"

1643, Nov. 16. A, 146. "To a Playe of Warre 00-00-06"
D, 62^v. "... then wth: Company to a Playe where was
a Disaster home to Sup." (The accounts entry is undated but comes between entries dated November 15 and November 21. The diary makes it evident that the date should be the sixteenth.)

In addition to its value for the individual facts recorded, Sir Humphrey's diary as a whole suggests several interesting generalizations. It is noticeable that though he does not, as a rule, give the name of the theater he visited, Blackfriars is clearly his favorite. He mentions it fourteen times, the Globe four times, and the Cockpit, or Phoenix in Drury Lane, three times. The plays which he refers to by title indicate that he visited the Blackfriars four times and the Cockpit once when no theater is named. The Fortune, the Red Bull, and Salisbury Court are not mentioned at all. Mildmay's preference for the Blackfriars and his neglect of the Fortune and Red Bull agree with other evidence of the popularity of the Blackfriars with the upper classes (though proximity probably was an influence on Mildmay; see the entry for May 6, 1635) and the low reputation of the other two. One would have expected him to attend the Salisbury Court occasionally, and it may be that he simply neglects to mention it.

The accounts are also interesting as confirmation of Malone's statement that "the king's company usually began to play at the Globe in the month of May" (*Variorum*, III, 70-71). Apparently the precise day in May for the transfer depended on the season, for Mildmay was at the Globe on the sixteenth and twenty-third in 1623 and at the Blackfriars on the sixth in 1635, the fifteenth in 1640, and the nineteenth in 1641. He was usually out of town at the probable time of

transfer back to Blackfriars in the winter. His earliest autumnal attendance at a play was October 27, 1638, when he saw Jonson's *Volpone* at Blackfriars.

In the ten years following January, 1631/32—he mentions no dramatic entertainment in 1642—Sir Humphrey records his attendance at fifty-seven plays and four court masques. Though in most instances he gives no titles, all the masques can be identified, and on twelve occasions he mentions the name of the play he saw. If we can assume that Sir Humphrey specifically mentioned the name of a play because he thought it somewhat above the ordinary run, then his taste, as demonstrated by the relative popularity of the different authors on his list, is much the same as that indicated in the miscellaneous allusions to dramatists in the reign of Charles I. Four of the plays were by Fletcher (*Rollo, Duke of Normandy, The lovers' progress, The elder brother, and The mad lover*), three were by Jonson (*Catiline, Volpone, and The alchemist*), two by D'Avenant (*The wits and Love and honour*), and one each by Shakespeare (*Othello*), Shirley (*The lady of pleasure*), and Carlell (*The spartan lady*). All but two of these plays appear in the extant lists of performances at the courts of James I and Charles I—a further suggestion that Sir Humphrey was a typical Cavalier in his dramatic taste.

Sir Humphrey's comments on the plays he saw tell us very little about him or about the audience of which he was a part, because in only one instance is his comment coupled with the name of a play, when he calls Shirley's *Lady of pleasure* "that rare playe." On five occasions he says that the play was new—further testimony to the well-known appeal of novelty in the theater of the time. Three times he calls the plays he saw "foolish." One is tempted to think that Sir Humphrey was anticipating some modern readers in their attitude toward many of the love and honor tragi-comedies, but a close reading of the diary suggests that he was more probably expressing annoyance at time wasted in the theater, since he so frequently chides himself for his theater attendance in phrases like "& was idle," "& loitred all the day," "I loste the whole day," "I loitered att a playe." Such phrases remind one of the half-hearted struggles of a more famous diarist to resist the lure of the theater.

JOSEPH WARTON ON THE IMAGINATION

HOYT TROWBRIDGE

I

JOSEPH WARTON'S conception of the imagination and its functions breaks apart quite clearly into three separate definitions. In that to be discussed first, Warton relates imagination to the marvelous, to the remote and strange; in the second, to originality or invention; and in the third, to visual imagery.

Throughout his critical writing, from 1753 to 1797, he expresses excited delight in the strange and fanciful, and especially in the bizarre and faraway past. In his last book, published when he was seventy-five, Warton writes:

We live in a reasoning and prosaic age. The forests of Fairy-land have been rooted up and destroyed; the castles and the palaces of Fancy are in ruins; the magic wand of Prospero is broken and buried many fathoms in the earth.¹

Similarly, at the very beginning of his critical career, writing in the *Adventurer* as a young clergyman thirty years old, Warton praises Shakespeare's "boundless imagination," particularly as it is shown in *The tempest*, where the poet "has carried the romantic, the wonderful, and the wild, to the most pleasing extravagance."² This is Warton's first clearly distinguishable definition of the term "imagination."

In his second definition Warton makes the term equivalent to originality. In connection with Pope's *Eloisa to Abelard*, he says that "POPE was a most excellent IMPROVER, if no great original INVENTOR."³ Of the *Rape of the lock* he writes:

It is in this composition, POPE principally appears a POET; in which he has displayed more imagination than in all his other works taken together. It should however be remembered, that he was not the FIRST former and creator of those beautiful machines, the sylphs; on which his claim to imagination is chiefly founded.⁴

¹ *Works of Pope*, ed. Warton (London, 1797), I, lv.

² *Adventurer*, No. 93. Addison also found Shakespeare to excel in "that noble extravagance of fancy" (*Spectator*, No. 419).

³ *Essay on the writings and genius of Pope* (London, 1756), I, 298.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 248. Warton's critic, Owen Ruffhead, commenting on these remarks, contends very reasonably that Warton is confusing two different terms, "invention" and [MODERN PHILOLOGY, August, 1937]

Thus Pope displayed his imagination by inventing, or half-inventing, the sylphs; in the *Eloisa* he showed his lack of it by depending upon Abelard's letters, which he merely "improved" into verse. In the same way Warton declares that the greatest poems "strike the imagination with what is Great, Beautiful, and New,"⁵ and he often complains that modern poets "fail of giving their readers new images."⁶ It seems quite clear, then, that Warton thought of novelty or originality as one of the functions of imagination.

In his third definition Warton gives the term an entirely different twist of meaning. In this definition the central quality of imagination is the power of conceiving or vividly responding to visual images. Here he follows Addison's analysis in the *Spectator*, where "the pleasures of the imagination" are defined as those which "arise from visual objects, whether when we have them actually in our view, or when we call up their ideas into our minds by paintings, statues, or any the like occasions."⁷

With this analysis in mind Warton praised the effects Pope achieved in *Windsor Forest* by "selecting such circumstances, as are best adapted to strike the imagination by lively pictures; the selection of which chiefly constitutes true poetry."⁸ This theory of poetry and the imagination is summarized in a very significant sentence: the power, Warton says, "of all others most essential to poetry" is that of "turning readers into spectators."⁹

This principle had three main lines of specific application. The first of these is personification and allegory, whose general importance in Warton's theory and in Collins' practice has been emphasized by Mr. A. S. P. Woodhouse.¹⁰ Warton speaks of personification as "one of the greatest efforts of the creative power of a warm and lively imagination,"¹¹ and his biographer Wooll speaks of the high spirit with which Warton used to comment to his classes at Winchester "on the

"Imagination," and wishes that before passing "these hasty censures" the critic "had previously defined the words . . ." (*Works of Pope*, ed. Ruffhead [London, 1769], V, 346).

⁵ *Essay* (1782, 1st issue), II, ii; also *Adventurer*, No. 80. The three adjectives are Addison's (*Spectator*, No. 412).

⁶ *Essay* (1756), I, 49.

⁷ *Essay* (1756), I, 27.

⁸ *Spectator*, No. 411.

⁹ *Essay* (1806), II, 160.

¹⁰ "Collins and the creative imagination," *Studies in English by members of University College, Toronto* (Toronto, 1931), pp. 58-130.

¹¹ *Adventurer*, No. 57.

prosopopeia of Oedipus or Electra."¹² Similarly he contends that two "paintings," or allegorical figures, in the first book of Lucretius are alone sufficient to prove him a great poet.¹³

The second application of this principle, by a natural extension of the metaphor "painting," gives great prestige as material for imaginative poetry to picturesque landscape. Thomson's descriptive scenes, Warton says, "are frequently as wild and romantic as those of Salvatore Rosa, pleasingly varied with precipices and torrents, and 'castled cliffs,' and deep vallies, with piny mountains, and the gloomiest caverns."¹⁴ Here there is an interesting fusion of the visual principle with interest in the bizarre and "wild."

The third application of this principle, and by far the most important, is a demand for circumstantiality as against abstraction and generality in the poet's descriptions, epithets, etc. "The use, the force, and the excellence of language," Warton writes, "certainly consists in raising *clear, complete, and circumstantial* images, and in turning *readers into spectators*."¹⁵ After illustrating through eight pages of quotation, Warton concludes: "I have dwelt the longer on this subject, because I think I can perceive many symptoms, even among writers of eminence, of departing from these *true, and lively, and minute* representations of Nature, and of *dwelling in generalities*."¹⁶ The contrast of this view with that of men like Johnson and Reynolds need not be labored. Poetry, said Johnson, "cannot dwell upon the minuter distinctions, by which one species differs from another, without departing from that simplicity of grandeur which fills the imagination."¹⁷

II

Warton is a transition figure, and his *Essay on Pope*, as Saintsbury once wrote, is "a real document, showing drift, but also drifting. The Time-Spirit is carrying the man along, but he is carried half-uncon-

¹² John Wooll, *Biographical memoirs of . . . Joseph Warton* (London, 1806), p. 100.

¹³ *Works of Virgil*, ed. Warton (London, 1753), I, 416.

¹⁴ *Essay* (1756), I, 43. Cf. Elizabeth Manwaring, *Italian landscape in eighteenth-century England* (New York, 1925), pp. 101-8.

¹⁵ *Essay* (1806), II, 160.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 160-68.

¹⁷ *Rambler*, No. 36. For other quotations see J. E. Brown, *The critical opinions of Samuel Johnson* (Princeton, 1926), pp. 115-18. Professor Sherburn finds Warton's love of particularity his only unusual position (*The early career of Alexander Pope* [Oxford, 1934], pp. 9-10).

sciously."¹⁸ Such a view of Warton's historical place is certainly sounder than that of Sir Edmund Gosse, who believed that Warton had created the theory of aesthetics according to which Wordsworth, Byron, and Keats wrote, and who saw the two Warton brothers as "bicyclist scouts who prophesied of an advance that was nearly fifty years delayed."¹⁹ Yet Saintsbury's conception of Warton may be misleading, for he goes on to say that the critic's inclination "is evidently towards something new—perhaps he does *not* quite know what—and away from something old, which *we* at least can perceive without much difficulty to be the Neo-classic creed."²⁰ The error in such a view is its exaggeration of drift away from neo-classicism, its underemphasis of backward pull. For in everything Warton wrote no fact is more obvious than the dominance in his thought of a traditional body of doctrine—a set of ideas which continually limited and bounded his own views and controlled his taste.

At the basis of his thought lay the cornerstone of all neo-classical doctrine—the belief that art imitates nature. (This dogma, Professor Lovejoy has shown, was subject to almost endless variations of interpretation, some of which are not characteristically eighteenth century. Warton's reading, while not extreme or unnecessarily rigid, was representative; it was, in fact, very much like that of Dr. Johnson.) Professor Lovejoy cites Warton as an exemplar of what is perhaps the most widespread and liberal of neo-classical conceptions of nature, that which defines it as "the universal and immutable in thought, feeling, and taste; what has always been known, what everyone can immediately understand and enjoy."²¹ This definition is well illustrated by Warton's contention that theories of philosophy and theology "are maintained and exploded in different ages; but true and genuine pictures of nature and passion, are not subject to such revolutions and changes. . . . Homer, Sophocles, Terence, and Virgil, being felt and relished by all men, still retain and preserve, unaltered and undisputed, admiration and applause."²² The same belief lies behind Warton's

¹⁸ *A history of English criticism* (New York, 1911), p. 260.

¹⁹ "Two pioneers of romanticism," *Proceedings of the British academy* (1915-16), pp. 146-47.

²⁰ Saintsbury, p. 261.

²¹ A. O. Lovejoy, "'Nature' as aesthetic norm," *MLN*, XLII (1927), 444-50.

²² *Works of Pope*, I, 254 n.

conclusion to the first volume of his *Essay on Pope*: "WIT and SATIRE are transitory and perishable, but NATURE and PASSION are eternal."²³ This belief was the basis of his central criticism of Pope, most of whose work, being moral and satiric, dealt not with nature and passion, which are eternal, but with temporary and local aberrations from them, with the affectations and mannerisms and beliefs of a particular time and place.

As to the nature of imitation, Warton accepts the very careful and exhaustive analysis of the term made by Richard Hurd in 1751. Hurd argues that, since poetry is an imitation or "original copying" of nature, and since "in any supposed combination of circumstances, one train of thought is, generally, most obvious, and occurs soonest to the understanding; and, it being the office of poetry to present the most natural appearances," it is inevitable that poets should resemble one another.²⁴ Warton accepts this definition and writes:

The works of those who profess an art, whose essence is imitation, must needs be stamped with a close resemblance to each other, since the objects material or animate, extraneous or internal, which they all imitate, lie equally open to the observation of all, and are perfectly similar. Descriptions therefore that are faithful and just, MUST BE UNIFORM AND ALIKE. . . .²⁵

Both Warton and Hurd seem to reduce imitation to description—though to description very broadly defined, as appears from the phrase "objects material or animate, extraneous or internal." Quite clearly Warton is attempting here to make an inclusive generalization, one which will cover all sorts of poetry and poetic material—persons as well as things, ideas as well as objects; in short, "reflection" as well as "sensation." In identifying imitation with observation and description Warton is far from the Aristotelian conception of *mimesis*, but the view is thoroughly representative of his period; its essential feature is the emphasis upon uniformity, upon "what has always been known, what everyone can immediately understand and enjoy."²⁶

The pull exerted by these ideas is well illustrated in Warton's three definitions of imagination. It was upon the first of these that Phelps, Beers, Gosse, and other early students of "pre-romanticism" based

²³ *Essay* (1756), I, 334; cf. Johnson, *Rambler*, No. 36.

²⁴ "A discourse on poetical imitation," in Horace, *Epistola ad Augustum*, ed. Hurd (London, 1751), pp. 133-34.

²⁵ *Essay* (1756), I, 89 f.; see also *Adventurer*, No. 63, and *Works of Pope*, I, 221.

their contention that he was a revolutionary critic, the first in his time to defy cold rationality and exalt the imagination. It is certain that Warton's taste was often for "the romantic, the wonderful, and the wild"; and yet it would be very erroneous to suppose that he was thoroughly committed to a poetry of pure fancy. The theory of imitation, even very liberally and generally interpreted, prevented any such systematic exaltation of the bizarre and mysterious.

It might have been supposed, for example, in view of the delight Warton took in Shakespeare's "vast exuberance of fancy," that he would approve strongly of Ariosto, the great master of marvels and romantic adventure. Instead he attacks Ariosto as an "extravagant and lawless rhapsodist," and says, quoting Hume, that Ariosto pleases not by his monstrous and improbable fictions, by his bizarre mixture of the serious and comic styles, by the want of coherence in his stories, or by the continual interruptions in his narration. He charms by the force and clearness of his expression, by the readiness and variety of his inventions, and by his natural pictures of the passions, especially those of the gay and amorous kind.²⁶

A still more interesting example, in view of the very high rank Warton assigned to Milton, is furnished by his paper in the *Adventurer* on "Blemishes in Paradise Lost." Here he criticizes the "glaring pictures" of Paradise and argues that it takes very little strength of mind to paint such scenes, in which are brought together "the greatest variety of the most splendid images, without any regard to their use or congruity." These, he says, "are easily feigned; but having no relative beauty as pictures of nature, nor any absolute excellence as derived from truth, they can only please those who, when they read, exercise no faculty but fancy, and admire because they do not think."²⁷

In both of these passages the pressure upon Warton of a traditional aesthetics is very clear. He objects to Milton's romantic picture because it is not natural, not derived from truth, and praises (by quotation from Hume) the one element of natural picture which is to be found in Ariosto. Thus Warton differs from some of his contemporaries—Reynolds and Johnson, for example—chiefly in being more willing than they to suspend disbelief, to forget propriety and restraint

²⁶ *Essay* (1806), I, 238 n.; cf. Hume, "Of the standard of taste" (1757), *Essays, moral, political, and literary*, ed. Green and Grose (London, 1898), I, 270.

²⁷ *Adventurer*, No. 101.

upon occasion. More than a hundred years earlier Thomas Hobbes had written: "In a good poem . . . both judgment and fancy are required: but the fancy must be more eminent; because they please for the extravagancy; but ought not to displease by indiscretion."²⁸ From this generalization Warton's enthusiasms represent no significant departure—except perhaps in one respect, that he never synthesized the two qualities, never worked out a systematic or consistent theory. It is typical of him that instead he should have extolled extravagancy in one essay and in another a few weeks later, with equal confidence, have demanded discretion.

The doctrine of imitation, as interpreted by Warton, was equally powerful in controlling his views on poetic originality. We have seen that he often regretted the lack of it in modern poets and agreed with Addison that the imagination delights not only in what is great and beautiful but also in what is new. Yet according to his own conception of artistic imitation of nature, poetic originality was hardly possible. Hurd's central argument had been that "common sense directs us, for the most part, to regard resemblances in great writers, not as the pilferings, or frugal acquisitions of needy *art*, but as the honest fruits of genius, the free and liberal bounties of unenvying *nature*."²⁹ Warton declares himself sensible of "what a late critic has urged, that a want of seeming originality arises frequently, not from a barrenness and timidity of genius, but from invincible necessity, and the nature of things."³⁰ Nor was this a mere gesture of polite approval for a recent and brilliant statement of traditional doctrine. Warton was essentially conservative on this whole question, for here, again, he was controlled by the belief that art communicates "the universal and immutable in thought, feeling, and taste."

His conservatism is especially clear in his rejection of Edward Young's ideas on this subject. Young's *Conjectures on original composition* (1759) had not been published when Warton dedicated the first volume of his *Essay on Pope* to him, but in the second volume and in his edition of Pope Warton made clear his rejection of his friend's views. He rejected them on several different grounds, the most fre-

²⁸ *Leviathan*, I, viii, in *Works*, ed. Molesworth (London, 1839), III, 58. See note by F. B. Kaye, "Current bibliography, 1660-1800," *PQ*, VII (1928), 178; and Donald Bond, "'Distrust' of imagination in English neo-classicism," *PQ*, XIV (1935), 54-69.

²⁹ Hurd, p. 136.

³⁰ *Essay* (1756), I, 89.

quently expressed of which was an objection to Young's belief that modern poets could and ought to surpass the ancients; with this heresy Warton, as a thoroughgoing admirer of the classics, could of course not agree.³¹ He felt, moreover—and this objection is still more significant—that the studious cultivation of originality had grave dangers. He wondered whether “when just models . . . have once appeared, succeeding writers, by ambitiously endeavouring to surpass those just models, and to be original and new, do not become distorted and unnatural, in their thoughts and diction.”³² Thus Cowley, because he attempted to be novel, “abounds in false thoughts; in far-sought sentiments; in forced, unnatural conceits.”³³ The recurrence of the word “unnatural” in these two passages indicates how closely Warton followed the prevailing views of his time. Here, as so often, he wavered between two extremes, though drawn toward both. He did not quite believe that poetry consists wholly in “Nature to Advantage dress'd, What oft was thought, but ne'er so well express'd.” And yet he felt that poets “must needs be stamped with a close resemblance to each other” and believed that the conscious pursuit of difference and originality must result in affectation, eccentricity, and unnaturalness.

A related but somewhat different conflict is involved in his plea for circumstantiality. We have seen that he believed in a uniform nature and in an art which, imitating nature, had a universal, eternal appeal. According to “the high neo-classical dogma,” Professor Lovejoy finds, “the germ of improvement or reform was one of simplification, standardization, the avoidance of the particular, the elimination of local variations and individual diversities. . . .”³⁴ That Warton accepted some such conception is shown by his belief, already referred to above, that Pope's enduring works were not the satires and moral essays—

³¹ In reply to Young, Warton writes, it might well be said: “You, indeed, have given us a considerable number of original thoughts in your works, but they would have been more chaste and correct if you had imitated the ancients more” (*Works of Pope*, I, 65-66 n.). Elsewhere he quotes at length from Reynolds' plea, in the third lecture of his *Discourses*, for knowledge of the classical masterpieces (*Works of Pope*, I, 257-59 n.). Young himself did not deny that “the classics are forever our rightful and revered masters in composition” (*Conjectures*, ed. E. J. Morley [Manchester, 1918], p. 16). Warton also objects against Young that he “had, perhaps, done better if he had followed” Pope's advice: “Learn hence for ancient rules a just esteem; To copy nature is to copy them” (*Works of Pope*, I, 252-53 n.).

³² *Essay* (1756), I, 204.

³³ *Essay* (1806), II, 349; cf. pp. 39-45. In his edition of Pope (I, 267 and 270), Warton quotes Johnson's similar view of Cowley (*Lives*, ed. Hill, I, 20-21), praising it as the best of Johnson's criticism.

³⁴ A. O. Lovejoy, “Optimism and romanticism,” *PMLA*, XLII (1927), 943.

which deal with local oddities and philosophical ideas which will change—but his poems of nature and passion, *Eloisa to Abelard* and the *Elegy to an unfortunate young lady*.

From this conception, however, a more questionable corollary was often drawn. It was argued that if nature, which poetry imitates, is defined as the invariant, the universal and uniform, then the poet must treat not the variable individual but the constant species. Poetry, therefore, cannot dwell upon the minuter distinctions, number the streaks of the tulip, or, in Reynolds' phrase, "finish every hair."³⁵ Clearly there is no place in such a view for Warton's "true, lively, and minute representations of Nature."

The curious and significant fact about Warton is that he should have failed to see this incompatibility. He accepted, as fully as anyone in his time, the more or less Horatian doctrine that poetry, if it is to have a permanent audience, must deal with eternal and unchanging materials. But at other times, quite disregarding this principle, he based his contentions on the more or less Longinian doctrine that poetry must be exciting, vivid, and expressive of an unusually live, warm, and sensitive personality. Occasionally, as in Warton's demand for vivid particularity, the inconsistencies between the two traditions are only too apparent.

Such contradictions, resulting from shifting the terms of an aesthetic analysis in the light of one or another critical tradition, could be traced in most of the eighteenth-century critics. On this particular point, however, contemporaries of Warton like Johnson and Reynolds were more clearheaded. Thus Johnson defended a generalized style—the "grandeur of generality"—not only because he liked it better but also because it was more consistent with the bases of his aesthetic theory. Warton, accepting the same basic assumption, defended a poetic style which departed radically from it. It is not surprising, therefore, that Johnson should sometimes have been irritated (as he was) by the diffuseness, the rambling, and the excessively eclectic enthusiasms of his friend.

III

The second section of this paper has shown the unsoundness, in view of the large element of strictly neo-classical theory in Warton's criticism, of any conception which makes him a revolutionary critic.

³⁵ Reynolds, *Discourses*, ed. Helen Zimmern (London, 1887), p. 179.

In this final section the sources of some of his most characteristic views will be presented, with the particular purpose of showing that even his most characteristic and unusual positions had precedent and sound authority in their support. Where Gildon was not with him, Addison was.

His leading principle—the definition of imagination as the power of “turning readers into spectators”—may be taken as an example. The *locus classicus* for this idea is a famous passage in Longinus. Warton quotes the sentence: Upon occasion, Longinus writes, the poet or orator “by reason of the rapt and excited state of his feelings, imagines himself to see what he is talking about, and produces a similar illusion in his hearers.”³⁶ How familiar this passage was to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century readers may be judged from the following echoes of it:

Dryden [1677]: “Imaging is, in itself, the very height and life of Poetry. It is, as Longinus describes it, a discourse, which by a kind of enthusiasm, or extraordinary emotion of the soul, makes it seem to us that we behold those things which the poet paints, so as to be pleased with them, and to admire them.”³⁷

John Dennis [1704]: “For the Spirits being set in a violent Emotion, and the Imagination being fir’d by that Agitation; and the Brain being deeply penetrated by those Impressions, the very Objects themselves are set as it were before us, and consequently we are sensible of the same Passion that we should feel from the things themselves.”³⁸

Leonard Welsted [1712]: “The next thing then the Critick points at is that happy boldness and mastery which Euripides discovers in the designing of his Images; but here I must remind you, that by the word ‘Images’ he understands no other than those enthusiasms and transports where the Poet seems to see the thing he is speaking of. . . .”³⁹

Addison [1712]: Livy “describes everything in so lively a manner, that his whole history is an admirable picture, and touches on such proper circumstances in every story, that *this reader becomes a kind of spectator*, and feels

³⁶ Longinus *On the sublime* 15 (trans. by H. L. Havell [London, 1890]), pp. 31–32.

³⁷ “Apology for heroic poetry,” *Essays of John Dryden*, ed. W. P. Ker, I, 186. This essay is generally agreed to represent the first impact of Boileau’s translation of Longinus, which had appeared three years earlier.

³⁸ “The grounds of criticism,” chap. iv, in W. H. Durham, *Critical essays of the eighteenth century 1700–1725* (New Haven, 1915), pp. 192–93.

³⁹ “Remarks on Longinus,” *The works in verse and prose, of Leonard Welsted, esq.*, ed. John Nichols (London, 1787), p. 415.

in himself all the variety of passions which are correspondent to the several parts of the relation."⁴⁰

John Hughes [1715]: "The Power of raising Images or Resemblances of things, giving them Life and Action, and presenting them as it were before the Eyes, was thought by the ancients to have something in it like Creation: And it was probably for this fabling Part, that the first Authors of such Works were call'd *Poets* or *Makers*. . . ."⁴¹

Pope [1715]: "What he [Homer] writes is of the most animated Nature imaginable; every thing moves, every thing lives, and is put in Action. If a Council be call'd, or a Battel fought, you are not coldly inform'd of what was said or done as from a third Person; the Reader is hurry'd out of himself by the Force of the Poet's Imagination, and turns in one place to a Hearer, in another to a Spectator."⁴²

Pope [1715]: ". . . *Homer* makes us Hearers, and *Virgil* leaves us Readers."⁴³

Joseph Spence [1726]: "Nothing can be more beautiful to the Eye, than these Landscapes are in the Poem: they make every thing present to us; and agreeably deceive us into an Imagination, that we *actually See, what we only Hear*."⁴⁴

Richard Hurd [1751]: ". . . To be able, on all occasions, to exhibit what the Greek Rhetoricians call *Phantasion*; which is, as Longinus well expresses it, when 'the poet, from his own vivid and enthusiastic conception seems to have the object, he describes, in actual view, and presents it, almost, to the eyes of the reader,' this can be accomplished by nothing less, than the genuine plastic powers of original *invention*."⁴⁵

Warton [1756]: "The whole train of imagery in this stanza is alive, sublime, and animated to an unparallelled degree; the poet [Dryden] had so strongly possessed himself of the action described, that he places it fully before the eyes of the reader."⁴⁶

Henry Home, Lord Kames [1762]: "Writers of genius, sensible that the eye is the best avenue to the heart, represent every thing as passing in our sight; and, from readers or hearers, transform us as it were into spectators."⁴⁷

⁴⁰ *Spectator*, No. 420 (my italics).

⁴¹ "Essay on allegorical poetry," *Works of Spenser*, ed. Hughes (London, 1715), I, xxiii.

⁴² Preface to *Iliad*, in Durham, p. 324.

⁴³ Durham, p. 330.

⁴⁴ *Essay on Pope's Odyssey* (London, 1726), I, 66; Longinus 15 is cited in a footnote.

⁴⁵ Hurd, p. 122. ⁴⁶ *Essay on Pope* (1756), I, 55.

⁴⁷ Kames, *Elements of criticism* (7th ed., 1788), II, 351.

Johnson [1781]: Pope "had Imagination, which strongly impresses on the writer's mind and enables him to convey to the reader the various forms of nature, incidents of life, and energies of passion. . . ." ⁴⁸

From this evidence it is obvious that Warton's central definition of imagination, which made it the power of turning readers into spectators, was far from original or even newly introduced. Nor were Warton's applications of this principle without precedent. It has been shown, in the first section of this paper, that he applied it, at various times, to picturesque "painting," to personification, and to circumstantial detail in description. Since the fad for the picturesque is well recognized to have been established in both poetry and criticism at least fifteen or twenty years before Warton's *Essay*, this aspect of his theory need not detain us here.⁴⁹ The second application is more illuminating, but since Mr. Woodhouse has already given an interesting account of the place assigned to personification in the criticism of Addison, Hughes, and Warton, and in the verse of Collins,⁵⁰ this too may be quite briefly dismissed. One of Addison's leading points in the essays on the imagination had been a defense of personification, simile, and allegory, through which, he says, "a truth in the understanding is, as it were, reflected by the imagination; we are able to see something like colour and shape in a notion, and to discover a scheme of thought traced out upon matter."⁵¹ The same idea is to be found in Hughes and in Pope.⁵² A still more direct influence on Warton, which Mr. Woodhouse does not mention, was that of Joseph Spence, under whose roof the *Essay on Pope* was begun.⁵³ Spence says that metaphor and allegory are the light of poetry, and that their chief use

⁴⁸ *Lives*, ed. Hill, III, 247.

⁴⁹ Miss Manwaring finds Thomson the chief literary influence in the picturesque movement (pp. 101-8).

⁵⁰ Woodhouse, pp. 101-2, etc.

⁵¹ *Spectator*, No. 421. Personification is discussed at more length, *ibid.*, No. 273.

⁵² Hughes writes that allegory "frequently gives life to virtues and vices, passions and diseases, to natural and moral qualities, and represents them acting as divine, human, or infernal persons" ("Essay on allegorical poetry," Durham, p. 95, cited by Woodhouse, p. 103; cf. Addison, *Spectator*, No. 419).

Of Homer's "allegorical fable" Pope writes: "How fertile will that Imagination appear which was able to cloathe all the properties of Elements, the Qualifications of the Mind, the Virtues and Vices, in Forms and Persons" (Durham, p. 327; Woodhouse does not mention the place of Pope in this tradition).

⁵³ Warton mentions this fact three times (*Essay* [1756], I, 154, and *Essay* [1806], II, 233; *Works of Pope*, I, xxvi; see also Wooll, p. 30).

and beauty is "to give *Light and Perspicuity* to a description; to cloath Words . . . with Substance; and to make *Language visible*. . . ." ⁵⁴ Spence writes of Pope, very much as Pope had done of Homer:

But all these Beautiful Pictures, are only Pictures of *still Life*; this Gentleman's Excellency reaches farther; he is as masterly in all his Motions, and Actions; he can teach his Pencil to express Ideas yet in the Mind; and to paint out the Passions of the Soul. ⁵⁵

That Warton read these ideas of personification into Longinus we know from two very interesting essays, purporting to be translations from newly discovered Longinian manuscripts, which he contributed to the *Adventurer*. That there is much more of Addison and Spence in them than there is of Longinus seems particularly clear in the second paper, where Warton writes:

It is the peculiar privilege of poetry, not only to place material objects in the most amiable attitudes, and to clothe them in the most graceful dress, but also to give life and motion to immaterial beings; and form, and colour, and action, even to abstract ideas; to embody the Virtues, the Vices, and the Passions; and to bring before our eyes, as on a stage, every faculty of the human mind. ⁵⁶

Warton's views on personification, by lending critical support to the "allegorical ode" written by himself, by Collins, and by Gray, helped to produce original creative work; the views themselves were anything but revolutionary.

Thus Longinus and Addison provide the sanction for Warton's love of personification. Quintilian is his authority for demanding concreteness and minuteness in description. Here Warton had no support from his chief master, Addison, who made no contention on this subject one way or the other. Quintilian, though emphasizing persuasion rather than poetic excitement as the end of speaking and writing, agreed with Longinus that writing should be more than bare narration, that facts should be "displayed in their living truth to the eyes of the mind." ⁵⁷ Longinus was content to quote some especially vivid pas-

⁵⁴ *Essay on Pope's Odyssey*, I, 38; see also II, 72. Spence also shared Warton's interest in the picturesque, giving special praise to the descriptions in Pope's Homer, "especially hanging Woods, Slopes, and Precipices" (I, 64). For Spence on the "sister arts" see I, 75-76, 83-86, and II, 191.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 68.

⁵⁶ *Adventurer*, No. 57.

⁵⁷ Quintilian *Institutes of rhetoric* viii. 3. 62 (trans. H. E. Butler [London, 1922]). Cited by Warton, *Essay* (1806), II, 168.

sages; Quintilian goes on to expound a method by which such vividness may be achieved:

So, too, we may move our hearers to tears by the picture of a captured town. For the mere statement that the town was stormed, while no doubt it embraces all that such a calamity involves, has all the curtness of a dispatch, and fails to penetrate to the emotions of the hearer. But if we expand all that the one word "stormed" includes, we shall see the flames pouring from house and temple, and hear the crash of falling roofs and one confused clamour blent of many cries: we shall behold some in doubt whither to fly, others clinging to their nearest and dearest in one last embrace, while the wailing of women and children and the laments of old men that the cruelty of fate should have spared them to see that day will strike upon our ears. . . . For though, as I have already said, the sack of a city includes all these things, it is less effective to tell the whole news at once than to recount it detail by detail.⁵⁵

In this respect, as in so many others, Warton had the support of his friend Spence. In his *Essay on Pope's Odyssey*, Spence cites the chapter in Quintilian which has been quoted just above, remarking that

With Poets and in History, there may be some Fraud in saying only the bare truth. In either, 'tis not sufficient to tell us, that such a City, for Instance, was taken and ravag'd with a great deal of Inhumanity: There is a Poetical Falsity, if a strong Idea of each particular be not imprinted on the mind; and an Historical, if some things are passed over only with a general mark of Infamy or Dislike.⁵⁶

Warton finds in Pope's *Windsor Forest* a parallel for Quintilian's ravaged city. In this passage, he says, the influences of peace and commerce

are expressed by selecting such circumstances, as are best adapted to strike the imagination by lively pictures; the selection of which chiefly constitutes real poetry. An historian or prosewriter might say, "Then shall the most distant nations crowd into my port:" a poet sets before your eyes "the ships of uncouth form," that shall arrive in the Thames.⁶⁰

This quotation makes a fitting conclusion to a survey of Warton's theory of the imagination. The selection of "lively pictures," he says,

⁵⁵ Quintilian viii. 3. 67-70.

⁵⁶ Spence, II (1727), 121. The passage is cited by W. D. MacClintock, *Joseph Warton's Essay on Pope, a history of the five editions* (Chapel Hill, 1933), p. 10.

⁶⁰ *Essay* (1756), I, 27; *Windsor Forest*, ll. 400 ff. Hurd made very similar contentions. For the poet, he says, "every minute mark and lineament of the contemplated form leaves a corresponding trace on his fancy." Conveying the liveliest ideas of these forms "is what we call painting in poetry; by which not only the general natures of things are described, and their appearances shadowed forth; but every single property marked, and the poet's own image set in distinct relief before the eyes of his reader" (pp. 121-22).

"chiefly constitutes real poetry"; and it will be remembered that one allegorical "painting" by Lucretius—"beautiful to the last degree, and more glowing than any figure painted by Titian"⁶¹—was enough to prove to Warton that its author was a supreme poet. It was this delight in and insistence upon the visual image, rather than his love for "the castles and the palaces of Fancy," which was the characteristic feature of his poetic theory. In one result of this delight, his demand for particularity, the future was certainly on Warton's side: soon we hear no more of the "grandeur of generality"; the poet is told to keep his eye on the object. But even in this contention, the only one that was unusual in his time, both Hurd and Spence were before him and Quintilian provided a classical sanction. And all his views, to repeat the conclusions of this paper's second section, fall within that broad and flexible framework of ideas whose central arch was "imitation of nature" and which dominated the criticism of Warton and his contemporaries.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

⁶¹ *Works of Virgil*, I, 416; see n. 13.

Re

con
son
circ
sta
how
whi
wor
con
and
lexi
pub
arra
coro
the
and
of R
of th
ume
thou
from
Roqu

T
natio
cept
each
given
9,412
Dou
Roqu
are a
the f
teent

1 A
fred E
mater

BOOK REVIEWS

Recueil général des lexiques français du moyen âge: I, Lexiques alphabétiques. ("Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes," Fasc. 264.) Paris: Champion, 1936. Pp. xxxiii + 522.

Beginning with Diez, Romanists have felt the need of the publication of a corpus of medieval lexicographical works. Gaston Paris, with the help of some of his students, had even begun the constitution of such a corpus, but circumstances did not permit him to carry the work beyond preliminary stages. Now Professor Roques has revived the project—on a scale more vast, however. He proposes to publish integrally all extant lexicographical works which fall in the medieval period and which contain French words.¹ These works form a number of categories: there are lexicons, separate glossaries composed to facilitate comprehension of some particular text, and marginal and interlinear glosses. Although they do not present the oldest material, the lexicons are, for reasons of expediency, to be published first. In the plan of publication they are separated into two main groups, those whose items are arranged alphabetically and those whose items are arranged in groups according to matter. These main groups are in each case further subdivided on the basis of whether their members are of a general or of a specialized nature and whether they are Latin-French, French-Latin, a bilingual combination of French with a language other than Latin, or French alone. The first part of the collection, then, is to consist of alphabetical dictionaries, and the volume which has appeared is devoted to a group of five manuscripts which, though often differing considerably in content, seem to derive in common from a Latin-French lexicon of the thirteenth century. This lexicon Professor Roques designates, after the initial word, as *Abavus*.

The five manuscripts are Rome, Vatican, Latin 2748; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Latin 7692; Douai 62; Evreux 23; and Conches 1. With the exception of the Conches manuscript, which closely approaches that of Paris, each is edited separately; the variants of Conches from Paris are, of course, given. Paris and Conches are the most extensive in material, Paris giving 9,413 items and Conches slightly fewer; the Vatican manuscript gives 5,856, Douai 2,662, and Evreux, which is fragmentary, only 853. From Professor Roques' remarkable critical study it seems evident that Douai and Evreux are abridgments, dating from the end of the thirteenth or the beginning of the fourteenth century, of the original *Abavus*. In the first half of the fourteenth century the *Abavus* appears to have undergone a revision in which

¹ Anglo-Norman material is to be gathered into a separate collection by Professor Alfred Ewert. Professor Roques expresses the hope that a similar collection of Provençal material will be undertaken.

new French translations were supplied and perhaps additional items and illustrative citations as well. This stage is represented by the Vatican manuscript. Toward the middle of the fourteenth century changes were again made in the French translations, and perhaps again the dictionary was enlarged. Paris and Conches are representatives of this final stage.

The volume will be useful to specialists in medieval Latin as well as to Romanists, since it may serve, as it were, as a supplement to Du Cange and the *Medieval word list*. Its immediate usefulness to Romance scholars would have been greatly increased if an index of the French words had been included, for the general French word index which Professor Roques promises on completion of the collection will undoubtedly be long years in appearing.

V. FREDERIC KOENIG

C. R. B. Educational Foundation
Brussels, Belgium

Der Stil der Davideis von Abraham Cowley im Kreise ihrer Vorläufer: ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung des "metaphysical wit" und des Epos vor Milton. By HANS-HELLMUT KREMPIEN. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co., m.b.H., 1936. Pp. 147.

Mr. Krempien examines the way in which Cowleyan wit and "metaphysical" wit proper operate in the *Davideis*; within the limits suggested by this analysis he then proceeds to compare the style of *Davideis* with the epic styles of Tasso, Du Bartas, Fuller, Crashaw, and Marino. This double examination enables him to conclude that the style of *Davideis* is much too complicated in pattern to be denominated by a single catchword or tendency.

If Mr. Krempien had been more familiar with the literature of his subject, he would not have felt that it was still necessary to dispute Dr. Johnson's treatment of Cowley as the chief "metaphysical poet." In the style of *Davideis* he perceives a union of "wit" and epic character; but this is not new, and neither is the perception that the new wit and couplet of Dryden are precipitated in the verse of Cowley. "Eine Linie (antik-epischer Stil) geht von Cowley weiter zu Milton, die andere—wit und couplet—zu Dryden" (p. 146). Mr. T. S. Eliot had already asserted that out of the high style of the Elizabethans the seventeenth century separated two qualities: wit and magniloquence, which were cultivated too exclusively by Dryden and Milton. But aside from such debatable liaisons, Mr. Krempien could have found in poets like Cartwright the new wit and couplet striving to disentangle themselves from the "metaphysical" style, in poets like Davenant another union of wit and epic character and in Dryden's prose a poet debating the rival claims of wit and heroic style. In a balance of talents and tendencies for a poet like Cowley nothing is to be gained by overlooking such manifestations.

While Mr. Krempien apparently believes that euphuism accounts for

English prose down to Cowley, he likewise appears to believe that prose can have little influence on verse; in any event, he does not find the *Davideis* euphuistic. The prose of Jonson's *Timber* and the verse of his *Epigrams* might have suggested other conclusions. If in descending to minuteness, under many headings, Mr. Krempien has sometimes lost the character of Cowley's style in the "exility of particles," he has at least refused to put the particles together again under such generalizations as "Barock," "gotisch," or "Rokoko." For this readers may be grateful, but they will find their profit in Mr. Krempien's analysis of the passage from "conceit" to "witty turn" in the verse of Cowley; this transition is made through "reflection" which, as here explained, carries wit from the ingenious connection of ideas to the "dialectical stamp of the thought," the pointed, surprising formulation.

GEORGE WILLIAMSON

University of Chicago

Bibliografia manzoniana: con prefazione di Giovanni Gentile. Volume Primo.

By MARINO PARENTI. Firenze: G. C. Sansoni, 1936. Pp. xxviii+208.

Prior to this publication the standard bibliographies of Manzoni were Vismara's (1875) and Salveraglio's (1890). Besides having lacunae, both of them are too old to be of any considerable use at the present time. Not only has Mr. Parenti undertaken to supplement and correct his predecessors, but he has also assumed the heavy burden of bringing the vast amount of bibliographical material on the subject up to date. The initial volume of his *Bibliografia manzoniana*, the result of fifteen years of arduous labor, is most gratifying in every respect for its completeness, accuracy of information, and attractiveness of typographical arrangement. It contains a chronological list of the general collections of Manzoni's works (thirty-two in all) published between 1828-29 and 1928, and a similar list of the editions of the *Promessi sposi* from 1825 to 1935 (four hundred and eighty in all, including the undated editions). These two lists are followed by a section on "Alcune considerazioni statistiche"—tables, with commentary, showing the topographical distribution of the editions of the novel, and fourteen interesting reproductions of title-pages and other documents. Pertinent facts on the history of the editions noted are given, and in numerous instances prefaces are transcribed *in toto* or *in parte*. The division on the general collections, incidentally, had already appeared in an attractive limited edition—*Bibliografia delle raccolte generali delle opere di Alessandro Manzoni* (Roma: Messaggero della Libreria italiana, 1933).

A thorough check by means of the bibliographies and catalogues accessible to me has revealed no important missing items published in Italy and only two items printed elsewhere. But even these two items are evidently the result of a slip, inasmuch as both are contained in Kayser's *Bücher Lexicon*, consulted by the bibliographer for other German editions. They are: I

Promessi sposi, storia milanese del secolo XVII scoperta e rifatta da Alessandro Manzoni. Edizione consentita dall'autore proprietario (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1876), and *I Promessi sposi, storia milanese del secolo XVII*, hrsg. von Theodor Link (München: J. Lindauer, 1908). Partial versions of the novel are either omitted because of their secondary importance or are left to be included in a second volume. Besides a fragment of the *Sposi promessi* (No. 480), the only other listed edition of this character is the historically significant Baudry edition of the thirty-fifth chapter of the *Promessi sposi*. It may be observed at this point that the remarks attributed to Vismara here, as well as some of the errors made by him in the description of editions of Manzoni between 1835 and 1846, should actually be assigned not to Vismara but to his source of information for these years—the *Bibliografia italiana*. Other Baudry editions cited by Parenti on the authority of Vismara, under Nos. 54 and 55, are announced in the *Bibliographie de la France* (September 26 and October 24, 1829, pp. 653 and 717) as the *nona* and *decima edizione*, words missing in the titles copied by Vismara. Since these editions have not been located, and since they correspond to the ninth and tenth editions under the year 1830 (Nos. 61 and 64), they should, in confirmation of Parenti's own deductions, be identified only with the latter year. Finally, to judge from an entry in Heinsius' *Bücher Lexikon* for 1842-46, it appears that some copies of the 1845 Milan edition of the *Promessi sposi* bear the names of two publishing houses, Redaelli (Milano) and Tendler und Compagnie (Wien).

The second volume of Parenti's bibliography will contain a list of partial collections of the works, single editions, translations, abridgments, and parodies, while the third and last will be devoted to biographical and critical studies on Manzoni. That these two forthcoming volumes will be model bibliographies may be inferred from the excellence exhibited by the one under examination; but if any further proof is needed, it will be found in the thoroughness of Mr. Parenti's bibliographical equipment as editor of the *Messaggero della libreria italiana*, compiler of *Le prime edizioni italiane* and owner of the largest private collection of Manzoniana.

Northwestern University

JOSEPH G. FUCILLA

Leigh Hunt (1784-1859). By LOUIS LANDRÉ. Paris: Société d'Édition "Les belles-lettres," 1936. 2 vols.

This is a valuable addition to the already imposing array of elaborate French studies of English authors. In making his "contribution to the history of English romanticism," Dr. Landré presents in the first volume "Leigh Hunt the author"—mainly a biography—and in the second volume "the work." The first impression of a reader with a strong sense of proportion is likely to be that here is too much about a minor figure, or at best a "second-rater"; yet this would be unfair. Hunt's position in his time was almost continuously im-

portant for half a century. When Blackwood's young "scorpions" attacked "Cockney poets" as objectionable innovators, Hunt was their chief object; Shelley and Keats were pupils whom he, their master, was corrupting. He had close relations with such major figures as not only the two just mentioned but also Byron, Lamb, Hazlitt, Carlyle, Dickens—not to prolong the list. He was conspicuous beyond the power to realize of one who now merely reads what he wrote, and he is all in this book of Dr. Landré's: the facts of his life; his relations with his contemporaries and the mutual influences; the characteristics of his writings of many kinds; his main ideas on the subjects he discussed. With all due credit to previous writers, the student need not go beyond this work to learn anything he may wish to know about Hunt, as well as many important things about persons greater than Hunt. Somewhere in Dr. Landré's book he will find what he wants. But, owing to its very thoroughness, the book is better for purposes of reference by means of its elaborate indexes than as something to read consecutively and as a whole. This is not to say it is badly written or uninteresting—quite the contrary; but it is a study which makes no concessions to popular methods of biography and criticism.

The biographical first volume is divided chronologically into four main chapters besides an introduction and a brief "post mortem." Chapter i deals with Hunt's career from 1784 to 1813, when his libel on the Regent in the *Examiner* landed him in jail. In this chapter Dr. Landré presents new material in relation to Hunt's father and on some other background topics. It was during the period covered by the second chapter, 1813 to 1825, that Hunt was most in the public eye: at first because of his imprisonment; later because of his championship of Shelley and Keats, the attacks of the *Quarterly*, *Blackwood's magazine*, and other periodicals on the "Cockney school," the unlucky journey to Italy to launch the *Liberal* and the resulting imbroglio with Byron. For obvious reasons most readers will find this chapter particularly interesting, and the controversial matters with which it deals are very judiciously handled. Chapter iii deals with the period from 1825 to 1840—"années de luttes et de misère." Chapter iv, 1840-59, begins with the gratifying stage success of *The legend of Florence* and presents the aging Hunt in easier circumstances, publishing many books that attained considerable popularity and suffering no more serious reverses than the hurt of being caricatured as Skimpole in *Bleak house*.

This biographical section of Dr. Landré's work has an important advantage over everything previously written about Hunt in the fact that he is the first to have made full use of the Leigh Hunt Collection of the late Luther A. Brewer, now in the possession of the University of Iowa. The notes contain almost innumerable references to that collection, in which there are many unpublished manuscript letters that cast new light on problems in relation to Hunt. In his biographical volume Dr. Landré also gives much more attention than anyone has previously given to the contemporary reviews of Hunt's

works, in each case stating the gist of the principal comments and thus providing valuable information as to the literary tastes of the time.

It is in the huge second volume that the elaborateness of Dr. Landré's study is most noticeable, and perhaps in some respects questionable. This volume has two main divisions: "The ideas of Leigh Hunt" and "The art of Leigh Hunt"; the first discussed in two long chapters, the second in three. Chapter i deals with Hunt as a reformer; and here, perhaps, is the most dubious proportion in the whole work, for 48 pages are given to Hunt's liberalism in religion as expressed in two of his least important books, the second of which was an elaboration of the first; as against 40 pages on his radical political views, which were the main cause of the opposition to him and of most of his troubles, as well as of the attacks on those who were considered to be of his "school." Chapter ii is on Hunt as a critic: first, of the stage, in which his very useful pioneer work is well discussed; next, of the plastic arts (briefly treated, as is right); and, finally, of literature. This last important division sums up thoroughly the preparation of Hunt for literary criticism, his tendencies, the influences on him, and the substance of his opinions of the chief authors whom he discussed. The question may be raised whether Dr. Landré stresses adequately what many have believed to be Hunt's chief merit as a critic of literature—the power to enjoy and to communicate his enjoyment of almost any sort of really good writing.

In the discussion of the art of Hunt, chapter iii deals with him as a poet; chapter iv, as a dramatist and romancer; chapter v, as an essayist. And here another question of proportion arises: Is his poetry sufficiently important to justify 115 pages on the poems as compared with about 70 on the literary criticism and 80-odd on Hunt the essayist? The question has more force when it is noted that in the last division are included not only essays in the ordinary sense of the term but short stories ("contes"), all the author's numerous descriptive writings about various parts of London, and even the *Autobiography* and *Lord Byron and his contemporaries* (treated as "essais autobiographiques").

The general plan of the work involves a good deal of overlapping and repetition. Thus in the first volume contemporary estimates of each book Hunt published are given, and the topical arrangement of the second volume often involves further discussion of the same writings in different places. It is but fair to say, however, that the author deliberately chose what he decided to be the most thorough method, no matter how many times it required mention of a single piece. This may make the work more valuable for reference, but it detracts from its readability.

In several appendixes various writings of Hunt, largely from the Brewer Collection, receive (in most cases) their first publication; and over a hundred pages of the second volume are occupied by a very thorough bibliography in three divisions: works of the author, criticisms, "ouvrages divers se rapportant à la vie et l'œuvre de Leigh Hunt." In the second division of the bibliog-

raphy, supplementing footnotes in Volume I on reviews of Hunt's work, the author gives the impression of intending to list all such reviews. For that reason it seems worth while to make some additions on which I happen to have memoranda, indicating the places in Dr. Landré's bibliography where the additions belong:

- Feast of the poets* (II, 525): *Critical review*, V (4th ser.; March, 1814), 293; *British critic*, I (new ser.; May, 1814), 549-51; *Eclectic review*, I (new ser.; June, 1814), 628-29; *New monthly magazine*, II (August, 1814), 58.
- Descent of liberty* (II, 525): *Theatrical inquisitor*, VI (April, 1815), 289.
- Rimini* (II, 525-26): *New monthly magazine*, V (March, 1816), 149; *Literary panorama*, Vol. IV (new ser.; September, 1816), col. 936.
- Round table* (II, 526): *Scots magazine*, LXXIX (February, 1817), 127-36; *Edinburgh magazine* (Constable's=new ser. of *Scots magazine*), I (LXXX of *Scots magazine*; November, 1817), 352-61.
- Foliage* (II, 526): *Monthly magazine*, XLV (May, 1818), 346; *New monthly magazine*, X (September, 1818), 162.
- Amyntas* (II, 527): *Edinburgh magazine* (new ser. *Scots magazine*), VII (September, 1820), 215-18.
- Liberal* (II, 529-30): *Literary chronicle*, October 19 and 26, 1822, pp. 655 and 675; *London museum*, October 26, 1822, p. 422; *Edinburgh magazine* (new ser. *Scots magazine*), XI (November, 1822), 561-73; XII (January and May, 1823), 9-16, 614-16.
- Ultra-crepidarius* (II, 530): *British critic*, XXI (new ser.; June, 1824), 647.
- Bacchus in Tuscany* (II, 531): *Literary gazette*, IX (April 23, 1825), 258-59.

There are many more errors in details than are listed in the author's sheets of corrigenda; but, since most of them are in English citations, they may have been not easily avoidable in the work of French printers and proofreaders. Less excusable are such blunders as assigning *The Castle of Otranto* to Mrs. Radcliffe (II, 176); crediting Browning with a poem called "Corelli" where the date indicates that "Sordello" is meant (II, 195); calling the Restoration poet John Wilmot, Earl of "Dorchester" (II, 248)—to mention the most striking examples in a list that could be prolonged. But it would be unfair to stress errors that do not detract seriously from the great value of Dr. Landré's work for every student of the long and important period covered by Leigh Hunt's life.

GEORGE L. MARSH

University of Chicago

Literary pioneers: early American explorers of European culture. By ORIE W. LONG. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935. Pp. vi + 267.

In this interesting book Dr. Long explores the beginnings of American scholarship in connection with the "Göttingen movement" of the early nineteenth century. In one sense the title is unhappy, for of the six pioneers here treated—Ticknor, Everett, Cogswell, Bancroft, Longfellow, and Motley—Longfellow alone was primarily interested in letters as apart from scholarship.

Yet all of them were belletristic; no one of them was concerned with other than the historical and linguistic sciences. Dr. Long's study interests all American humanists, but more particularly students of American and German literature.

It was not Dr. Long's purpose to present a complete biography of each individual. The men are presented to us as youthful, eager students in their most impressionable and formative years. Their personal relations with Goethe and other noteworthy Germans are stressed. The sources used are many, but are chiefly old letters and diaries. Dr. Long has devoted years of painstaking research to his subject and makes available much inedited material, besides skilfully assembling matter already printed but scattered in volumes difficult of access. The subjects of the biographies speak for themselves in copious quotation.

As is well known, Ticknor and Everett were the first Americans to study in a German university, matriculating in Göttingen in 1815. Their earliest letters reveal them as priggish young Puritans, shocked at the universal profanity rife among Germans. Even ladies break out with enormities like *Gott im Himmel*. They are puzzled by the contrast between the inner culture of their German friends and the outer crudity of their manners. But soon they begin to thaw and mellow in an atmosphere of general kindliness. For the first time the two young Americans encountered erudition, thoroughness, and scholarly method. They were intelligent enough to admire and profit.

Ticknor, in particular, noted the superiority of laboratory and library equipment. He immediately wrote to the president of Harvard, formulating plans for the betterment of the Harvard Library. It is curious to note him complaining, as early as 1816, of the American vice of expending too much for luxurious buildings to the neglect of the only things that count, a scholarly faculty and laboratory and library facilities for their work. He admired Göttingen for its almost complete lack of buildings. "We are mortified and exasperated because we have no learned men, and yet make it physically impossible for our scholars to become such, and to escape from this reproach we appoint a multitude of professors, but give them a library from which hardly one and not one of them can qualify himself to execute the duties of his office." This scolding brought no immediate benefit to a Harvard which was later to learn this lesson and learn it well. It is sad to reflect how many presidents and boards of our lesser institutions need the same advice which Ticknor offered one hundred and twenty years ago.

Nothing astonished and pleased the pilgrims from "free America" more than the intellectual freedom of their instructors. Here they found no theological shackles. Professors boldly subjected the Scriptures to higher criticism, assailed dogmas, and even attacked existing political institutions. The state never molested them. American students of today will gain much from German universities; but they will not find the same atmosphere of freedom nor will they return, like these pioneers, convinced that, though superior to

Germany in political freedom, America is, by comparison, in intellectual slavery.

All six of these men had a Harvard connection, but Harvard failed tragically to profit to the full by the new learning and idealism they had found abroad. The divines were firmly in the saddle; the youngsters were impatient, bumptious, and tactless. Everett used his professorship as a stepping-stone to a senatorial career. Ticknor, with a free hand in his own department, fought hard to convert Harvard into a real university in the European sense. His ideas were admirable and would have borne fruit if the institution had been properly staffed to carry them out; but, as President Eliot once remarked, Ticknor was fifty years in advance of his time. It required two generations to break the clerical yoke. Irrked by lack of co-operation, he resigned in favor of Longfellow, to devote his opulent leisure to the writing of *The history of Spanish literature*, to the development of the Boston Public Library, and to his hobby of social lion-hunting. Cogswell and Bancroft found Cambridge impossible and established the famous Round Hill School, where, until they split on the rock of finance, they applied successfully the principles of German pedagogy. Their later careers—Bancroft's as historian, and Cogswell's as first director of the Astor Library—showed the profit derived from their scholarly training. The sunny Longfellow, who as a youth was tolerant and not easily shocked by European manners, was equally adaptable in Cambridge. He alone was happy there. Luckily for his peace of mind, he had no zeal for academic reform. Any other of the six was capable of contributing more scholarly renown, but, like his successor Lowell, Longfellow contributed little aside from literary kudos. Motley, the most human of the group, would have been an impossible professor for the times. He went to Europe apparently without a single Puritan inhibition. Fond of *Wein, Weib, und Gesang*, the bosom friend of Otto Prince Bismarck, he was like a fish in water at Göttingen. Tobacco and beer did not injure his scholarship, but his kindly sympathy for the underdog betrayed this tolerant man into becoming a biased historian. His later career demanded a European stage.

None of these men lived to see the Promised Land. They were truly pioneers who envisaged what American universities, scholarship, and letters should become. Dr. Long brings out clearly the debt we owe to these scholars on whose foundations we are still trying to build. He has the distinction of writing a book as readable as it is scholarly.

G. T. NORTUP

University of Chicago

"T
19
de
ga
TH
pp
tio
by
son
in
lat
qu
ind
por
goi
of
kne
53)
Ch
at L
by
the
clos
all t
of t
con
ante
shan
wou
man
to t
man
futu

In
obvi
Goos
pies.

BRIEFER MENTION

Dr. J. Van Mierlo's *Het Roelantslied, met Inleiding en Aanteekeningen*, "Kon. Vlaamsche Academie, Verslagen en Mededeelingen" (Gent: Februari, 1935; pp. 35-166) is an uneven piece of work. Much of the introduction is devoted to a presentation, mostly commendatory, of the arguments that have gathered against Bédier's theory of the origin of the *Chanson de Roland*. Though clear and judicial on several important questions (e.g., the relics, pp. 65-72, 81-83), this survey is on the whole rather uncritical. More questionable still is Van Mierlo's laborious support of the thesis formerly presented by another Belgian scholar, J. H. Bormans, that the first of the short epic songs which, according to their views, preceded the *Chanson de Roland* were in the Teutonic tongue of their hero Hruodland. This is, of course, pure speculation; our four preserved Dutch-Flemish fragments throw no light on the question since the four are part of one and the same work, undeniably (as indicated by mistranslations) derived from a French *Roland*. But there is a portion of Van Mierlo's work which should not pass unnoticed: his thoroughgoing study of the bearing of the four fragments on the question of the origin of the *Chanson de Roland*. From several features he argues that the writer knew nothing of the embassy of Ganelon or of the Baligant episode (pp. 50-53), which of course supports the view that our Oxford manuscript of the *Chanson* was preceded in date by a French epic dealing only with the battle at Roncevaux. An antecedent to the *Chanson de Roland* is similarly suggested by the order of certain episodes in the Flemish (pp. 55-57), and even more by the extreme conciseness of the fragments (the Flemish and French never run close together for more than four or five lines) and their almost total lack of all that makes for beauty, pathos, and nobility in the corresponding sections of the *Chanson de Roland* (pp. 54-55, 92 ff.). It might have been noted in this connection that, if the eleventh-century writer worked mostly from French antecedents of about the same aesthetic value as our Flemish fragments, his share as creative poet remains very large indeed. Also Van Mierlo's argument would have been more convincing had the problem of the relation of the German *Rolandslied* (which does have the embassy and the Baligant episodes) to the Flemish fragments been frankly faced instead of being ignored. But many of the questions raised certainly incite reconsideration at the hands of future investigators.—GERMAINE DEMPSTER.

In the recent comparisons of medieval romances with popular tales an obvious desideratum has been a discussion of the relations of the story of the Goosegirl (Grimms, *Household tales*, No. 89) and the legend of Berte aus grans pies. The task is particularly interesting because it concerns a tale with ob-

vious Germanic associations. Adolf Memmer undertakes it in *Die altfranzösische Bertasage und das Volksmärchen* ("Romanistische Arbeiten," Vol. XXV [Halle: Niemeyer, 1935]; pp. xvi+345, with one plate). He follows—*sed longo intervallo*—the so-called Finnish method, but does not adopt the convenient system for referring to tales or imitate the careful argumentation of the Finns. The abstracts of tales (pp. 1–51) are difficult of access and the bibliographical references to literary texts (pp. 119–21) are needlessly separated from the summaries. The materials are incomplete: I note tales cited in Bolte and Polfvka, *Anmerkungen* (notes on No. 89) to which Memmer makes no reference. The citations are careless: read, e.g., *Geschichtsblätter für Stadt und Land Magdeburg* (p. 3), Liungman (p. 6), Kilderne til (p. 86), etc. Matters which obviously demand attention are not followed through; e.g., Kurt Schmidt's recent and excellent study of the revisions of Grimms' *Tales* should have suggested the need for comment on "O Folle" (p. 68). Bolte and Polfvka call "O Folle" an insertion into the edition of 1856, and Memmer simply copies their remark. Berchta, a figure belonging to the lower mythology of southeastern Germany and the adjoining region of Austria, deserves more attention than she receives on page 171 (see Waschnitius, "Perht, Holda und verwandte Gestalten," *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, philosophisch-historische Klasse*, Vol. CLXXIV, No. 2 [1914]). The three fate-goddesses are said (p. 60) to have been worshiped in the North ("nordische Länder")—Memmer seems to include Germany in this term; but the evidence needs a critical review to which he does not subject it. Further comment is perhaps unnecessary. On such foundations we cannot erect a solid structure. We are grateful to Memmer for reminding us that the story of Berte aus grans pies offers problems. These problems are various; e.g., more needs to be said about Berte's queer feet (my brief article "Gänsefüssig," *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*, Vol. III [Berlin, 1930–31], cols. 297–98, deals superficially with the subject and might be supplemented by J. Reinhold's article cited by Brückner, *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, XX [1910], 215—an article which might well have attracted Memmer's attention). Texts are yet to be reprinted from manuscripts: the romance in 23,320 lines by Girard d'Amiens (p. 131) is perhaps too long to find an editor soon, but the two folios of the *Chroniques de France* (p. 132) are a modest undertaking. Some day someone will settle whether the story of the Goosegirl is really German or Germanic after all; we have always assumed it to be (p. 111).—A. T.

The very complicated history of the many medieval texts narrating the story of the Knight of the Swan (Lohengrin; Chevalier au Cygne) is yet to be cleared up. In *Die Quellen der Schwanritterdichtungen* (Gifhorn [Hannover]: Adolf Enke, 1936; pp. 297), A. G. Krüger lays a foundation for further studies. The lack of a bibliography, an index, or cross-references from one chapter to another makes it difficult at times to follow the argument. Although

many articles about the pertinent texts are cited and discussed, many more might have been gathered from such works as G. Ehrismann's *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*. Strangely enough, this standard work is not once mentioned. By way of completeness let me add a reference to Georges Doutrepont, "La Légende 'du chevalier au cygne' pendant le XVI^e siècle," *Mélanges offerts à M. Abel Lefranc* (Paris, 1936), pp. 26-36; this appeared too late for Krüger to use. Again and again Krüger indicates our scanty knowledge of the subject. For example, the Elixie version (p. 18, n. 5) has never been published; the origin of the German *Lohengrin* as well as its relations to *Lorengel* are still obscure (p. 70); and the connections of Wagner's opera and Konrad von Würzburg's *Schwanritter* call for further study (pp. 87-91). Further investigation of this last subject is an attractive enterprise involving the comparison of only a few texts. Contrary to Wagner's assertion that he took with him to Marienbad only Görres' edition of *Lohengrin* and two versions of *Parzival* (one by Simrock and one by San Marte), Krüger maintains that Wagner used a brief summary of Konrad von Würzburg's *Schwanritter* as found in Grimm's *Deutsche Sagen* and the *Schwanritter* itself. Inasmuch as Konrad's poem was available at that time only in a comparatively rare edition, very strong evidence is needed to disprove Wagner's own assertion. A few of the comparisons seem farfetched; e.g., in both versions the knight takes leave of the swan in eight lines of verse. Such an agreement does not seem to have much value. The fact that Krüger's book suggests these and other problems constitutes its peculiar merit.—A. T.

In the last few years the value of sermons as a source of information about contemporary ideas and culture has come to be appreciated. G. R. Owst has turned our attention to medieval English materials, and other scholars have been digging in the sermons of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These studies should involve some consideration of the theory of preaching. For this investigation we now have a firm foundation in Harry Caplan's lists of medieval texts: *Mediaeval 'artes praedicandi'; a handlist* ("Cornell studies in classical philology," Vol. XXIV [Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1934]; pp. 52) and *Mediaeval 'artes praedicandi'; a supplementary handlist* ("Cornell studies," Vol. XXV [1936]; pp. vi+36). These lists collect the references to the manuscripts in very convenient form and indicate the comparatively few modern editions. It did not fall within Caplan's plan to survey the investigation of medieval homiletic theory. His indexes call attention to many unpublished texts, chiefly in Latin. Since these texts are usually brief, they are attractive and inexpensive enterprises for American scholars. A few texts are in German. For example, there are two German versions of "Cum predicare volueris" (Supplement, No. 33) and one of another text without title (Supplement, No. 41a). These brief texts are worth studying. Investigation of the style of medieval sermons has been the business of theologians rather than students of literature, but this situation may change. I add the follow-

ing references on medieval German preaching as a suggestion for further study: F. R. Albert, *Die Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland bis Luther* (Gütersloh, 1892-96); R. Cruel, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter* (Detmold, 1879); F. Landmann, *Das Predigtwesen in Westfalen in der letzten Zeit des Mittelalters* ("Vorreformationsgeschichtliche Forschungen," Vol. I [Münster, 1900]); A. Linsenmayer, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Ausgange des 14. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1886); L. Pfleger, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Predigt und des religiösen Unterrichts im Elsass während des Mittelalters," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, XXXVIII (1917), 661-717; and "Zur Geschichte des Predigtwesens in Strassburg vor Geiler von Kaysersberg," *Strassburger Diözesanblätter*, XXVI=3. Folge, IV (1907), 248-68, 298-314, 344-60, 392-416. See additional titles in F. C. Dahmann and G. Waitz, *Quellenkunde zur deutschen Geschichte*⁹ (Leipzig, 1931), p. 571, No. 8907, and Gustav Wolf, *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte*, I (Gotha, 1915), 133-34, n. 1.—A. T.

One of the last fruits of the scholarly activity of the late H. R. Lang is the dissertation suggested by him to Theodore Babbitt: *La Crónica de Veinte Reyes: a comparison with the text of the "Primera crónica general" and a study of the principal Latin sources* (New Haven, 1936). This chronicle, like the *Primera crónica general*, has as its chief source the histories of Rodrigo de Toledo and Lucas of Tuy; but, according to Mr. Babbitt, neither work borrowed directly but drew from a fusion of both, whether in Latin or in Spanish, which is now lost to us. The source relationships are extremely intricate and vary with each portion of the text. Mr. Babbitt has untangled them to the best of his ability, well aware that much can never be accurately determined, owing to the hopeless loss of many of the sources. From his analysis a thesis emerges: that the Twenty Kings is older than the First Chronicle. Mr. Babbitt advances this new theory modestly, for it contradicts that expressed by Menéndez Pidal. While one will await with interest the Spanish scholar's reply, it would seem that the younger author's view is based on a far more minute examination of this particular text than any previously made. If it be true that the Twenty Kings is the older of the two chronicles, that fact is of much importance to the student of the evolution of the Spanish epic legends. The epic prosifications contained in the Twenty Kings do in fact seem to be one stage earlier than those in the First Chronicle.—G. T. N.

Marius Lange's *Vom Fabliau zu Boccaccio und Chaucer* ("Britannica," Heft 8 [Hamburg, 1934]; pp. 155) is a most meticulous analysis of four versions of the cradle story, viz., Boccaccio's, two fabliaux, and the *Reve's tale*. Its merit lies in richness and adequacy of expression where the author points out strong contrasts or delicate nuances between the different treatments of the same theme. The study is unfortunately vitiated by a systematic attempt to build up and keep up a contrast between Chaucer, on the one hand, and Boccaccio and the *trouvères*, on the other hand—or, to be more explicit, be-

twee
ampl
the n
be (p
being
sister
of hi
quest
not l
what
of Cl
from
but s
fact
'half,
direct

No
Cante
H. D
certa
rende

While
feelin
the ge
sible,
the pr
ful im

tween Germanic richness and fulness and Romanic shallowness. Good examples are the chapter on humor, where the *Decameron* and fabliaux are, for the need of the cause, brought much more closely together than they should be (p. 93); and the treatment of *Naturgefühl*, the utter lack of such a sense being of course characteristically Romanic (p. 127). (With creditable consistency the author applies similar views as to racial differences to the making of his bibliography, all non-German works being left out.) Apart from such questionable theories, no fact emerges from this 155-page analysis that has not long been known to all students of Chaucer's sources. Besides, much of what is presented in the last chapters (the statements of the religious attitude of Chaucer and Boccaccio, e.g., pp. 147 and 153) could surely not be derived from any study of the *Reve's tale* and its analogues. Errors of details are few but serious. A meeting of Chaucer and Petrarch is presented as established fact on page 150. On page 132 the phrase *mi tort mi droit* where *mi* means 'half,' is classed among the passages in which the writers address their readers directly using the first person!—GERMAINE DEMPSTER.

No praise is too high for Professor A. J. Barnouw's translation of the *Canterbury tales*—*De Vertellingen van de Pelgrims naar Kantelberg* (Haarlem: H. D. Tjeenk, Willink & Zoon N.V., 1930, 1932, and 1933)—into the language certainly best suited for the purpose. Again and again Chaucer's lines are rendered word by word into perfect Modern Dutch verse:

"This passeth forth al thilke Saterdag,
That Nicholas stille in his chambre lay,
And eet and sleep, or dide what him leste,
Til Sonday, that the sonne gooth to reste [A.3419 ff.].

"Dit gaat zijn gang dien heelen Zaterdag
Dat Nicalaas stil in zijn kamer lag,
En at en sliep en deed al wat hem lustte
Tot Zondag toen de zonne ging te ruste."

While such passages could often be translated equally closely in German, the feeling of Chaucerian lightness and rapidity might be lost in the heaviness of the gender and case endings. Close translation, of course, was not always possible, and Dr. Barnouw's greatest merit and remarkable success is in finding the proper turns, especially the colloquial or even dialectical phrases, the colorful images, the racy words needed in the fabliaux:

"This knave gooth him up ful sturdily,
And at the chambre-dore, whyl that he stood,
He cryde and knocked as that he were wood [A.3434 ff.].

"Met fiksche stappen klautert deze guit
Naar boven toe en aan de deur der kamer
Gaat hij te keer met schreeuwen en gehamer."

—GERMAINE DEMPSTER

In some ways the social and economic turmoil which followed upon the Middle Ages resembles the conflicts of our own day. Perhaps for this reason scholars are turning more and more frequently to the investigation of problems in post-medieval German literature. E. G. Gudde's study, *Social conflicts in medieval German poetry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1934; pp. iii+139), which deals more extensively with post-medieval literature than its title suggests, illustrates well the new interest in the social, political, and economic backgrounds of literature and at the same time treats with independent judgment a rather neglected period. Gudde throws his net wide. The Dutch authors Jacob van Maerlant and Jan van Boendale are, for example, figures which the ordinary student of German literature would not have examined. In other ways, too, Gudde shows an admirable catholicity of interest. He begins his comment on social organization as reflected in literature with the Eddic "Risgþula" and the place-legend of the "Giant's plaything" (here he might have cited Valerie Höttges, *Die Sage vom Riesenspielzeug* [Jena, 1931], with my additions in *MP*, XXIX [1932], 531-32, rather than Chamisso's version). He mentions several times (p. 87, n. 269; p. 104, n. 319; p. 117, n. 363) the proverb "When Adam delved and Eve span, / Who was then the gentleman?" which may have originally been a fragment of an English revolutionary song. The use of this proverb offers an opportunity for a brief essay in literary history. On so broad a basis as that of early Germanic literature, German tradition, and proverbs, Gudde erects his study. An analysis and criticism of his results, which rest upon a reading of most of the important literary monuments between 1300 and 1500, will exceed the limits set for this notice, and I can comment only on details. Gudde's definition of *Meistergesang* is perhaps too loose. Certainly Hans Rosenplüt, on the one hand (p. 86), should not have been called a Meistersinger, and Jörg Schilher (p. 105; Schiller is a better spelling), on the other, a folk poet. The crying need for better studies and editions of such post-medieval writers as Frauenlob, Muscatblüt, and Barthel Regenbogen (see now Kaben's recent dissertation—an edition is still needed) appears again and again in the course of Gudde's essay. Occasionally Gudde might have cited works in the more accessible form of magazine articles than as reprints, e.g., Pfeiffer, *Märe von den Gähühnern* and Schröder, *Die Gedichte des Königs vom Odenwalde* (p. 132), or in other and better editions, e.g., Bezzenberger, *Freidanks Bescheidenheit* (p. 130; see Grimm's first edition) and Karajan, *Michel Beheims Buch von den Wienern* (p. 131; use 2d ed. of 1867). It is pleasing to see that he has had access to Primisser's rare edition of Suchenwirt. All in all, Gudde has made a useful addition to our knowledge and one likely to encourage others to further study.—A. T.

A brief survey of German literary history designed for the general reader in France will naturally and properly give little space to writings before 1700. In his *Histoire de la littérature allemande* (Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1936;

pp. 215), G. Bianquis devotes only forty-one pages to such writings. In the brief characterizations necessary in such a work a turn of a phrase can often convey a misapprehension; e.g., *Treue germanique* when used in connection with the *Heliand* of the ninth and the *Nibelungenlied* of the thirteenth century (pp. 11, 19) suggests the familiar *Deutsche Treue*—a phrase first used, so far as I can discover, in 1577. In grouping together Fouqué, Hebbel, Wilhelm Jordan, and Richard Wagner as authors who have re-worked the story of the Nibelungen, the differences in sources and aims fail to become apparent. The differences between the Scandinavian and German forms of the story are not indicated, and the subtle influence of French ideas on the *Nibelungenlied* is not brought out. By being placed at the end of the account of the medieval period (p. 27), Freidank's *Bescheidenheit* fails to impress one as moralization contemporary with *Parzival* and the *Nibelungenlied*. The *Sprachgesellschaften* (p. 36) drew more extensively on Italian societies than on the French academy. Let us turn to a later period in German literary history. The phrase *On a parfois joint Heine* (p. 103) does not suggest that the official condemnation of the Young Germans in 1835 included Heine. The writing of historical novels occupied no important part in Theodor Mundt's activities until after his marriage to Luise Mühlbach in 1839, and by that time Young Germany in the strict sense of the term was no more. We can hardly say that the writers of Young Germany won Rahel Varnhagen von Ense, Charlotte Stieglitz, and Bettina von Arnim to their cause of political liberalism. Rahel, a leader and not a follower, was proclaiming ideas characteristic of Young Germany long before Gutzkow, Mundt, or Wienbarg appeared on the scene. Inasmuch as she died in 1833, she cannot be considered to be a companion-in-arms of the poets of 1848 who had been defending the cause of national unity since 1841. Charlotte and Bettina exerted a great personal influence, each in her own way, but neither can be regarded as the champion of a cause. In sum, Bianquis does not achieve the neat and accurate characterizations which we are accustomed to find in French works. His other studies have been of a much higher quality than this.—A. T.

The study of seventeenth-century German lyric verse is notably advanced by two recent editions of conspicuous authors. The *Trutznachtigall* of Friedrich von Spee, the great Catholic poet, is now reprinted by Gustave Otto Arlt from the edition of 1649 with the variants from the manuscripts ("Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke aus dem 16. und 17. Jahrhundert," Nos. 292-301 [Halle: Niemeyer, 1936]; pp. xxiv+344+xxv-clxxxi). The introduction establishes the value of the edition of 1649 as the author's last revision. Contrary to the usual experience of editors, the manuscripts are earlier and less valuable versions. The careful tabulation of the variants enables us to see the development of Spee's technique. Supplementary to the edition are Arlt's studies: "Friedrich von Spee's 'Trutznachtigall': the editions and a bibliography," *MP*, XXXIII (1935), 159-69; and "Friedrich von Spee and Martin

Opitz: a contrast in the mechanics of lyric technique," *Modern language forum*, XXI (1936), 65-75. This edition and these studies supply a firm foundation for the further investigation of a notable poet. It is altogether pleasant to see the work of an American scholar accepted by so justly famous a series as the "Neudrucke." A companion piece to Arlt's edition of Spee is W. Ziesemer's edition of Simon Dach: *Gedichte*, Vol. I ("Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft, Sonderreihe," No. 4 [Halle: Niemeyer, 1936]; pp. xvi+371). In contrast to Spee, Dach never collected his verses, and this edition is the climax of a long series of scholarly efforts to compile a collection. The present volume contains occasional poems, chiefly epithalamia. A second volume of the same sort is promised, to be followed by two volumes of spiritual songs. Ziesemer has found a large number of "lost" poems. When his edition is complete, we may expect to see a reawakening of interest in Dach. Ziesemer's work gives every evidence of care; the printing is admirable.—A. T.

Poor Collins: his life, his art, and his influence, by Edward Gay Ainsworth, Jr. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1937; pp. x+340), is, so far as it goes, a very useful study. The volume opens with a clear and compact summary of the little that is now known concerning Collins' life; the rest of Part I ("The mind and art of Collins") examines in considerable detail the poet's "ideas of man, of nature, and of human life" as expressed in the poems and, more briefly, his conception of poetry. Part II is an inventory of the principal sources in classical and English literature from which Collins drew his diction and certain of his images and themes; the result, in spite of a fair number of inconclusive parallels, is to establish more clearly than has been done before the persistently imitative character of his work and especially the omnipresent influence of Milton. Part III shifts the emphasis from Collins himself to his readers, and, after tracing the rise of his literary reputation to about 1830, attempts to illustrate, in some twenty writers between Chatterton and John Clare, the specific contribution of his poems to the "romantic movement." On all these topics Mr. Ainsworth has fresh things to say and some new details to add to the researches of earlier scholars. He has been conscientious in reporting the findings of his predecessors and judicious in assessing their value, with the result that his book is, within the limits of its critical method, an unusually trustworthy and serviceable guide.

What is lacking—it has, indeed, been notably absent from discussions of Collins in the past—is any consideration of the poems in their own terms as individual objects of art. Several of the poems—the *Ode to Liberty*, the *Ode on the poetical character*, and the *Ode to evening*—are, it is true, outlined in some detail. But the method of analysis which Mr. Ainsworth applies in these cases hardly goes beyond an indication of the obvious sequences of images and thoughts, and these are significant for him not as formal elements in an artistic design but chiefly as manifestations of the recurrent interests, tastes, convic-

tions, and sensitive reactions of Collins the man. The individual poems, in other words, tend to disappear as such; the discussion, whether it is concerned with Collins' "mind" or with his "art," resolves itself into a series of universal statements which, taken separately, are true not only of various poems by Collins but also of many poems by his contemporaries and predecessors, and true equally of excellent poems and of mediocre ones. When all these general statements are added together, the result, to be sure, is a complex of characteristics which may be said to constitute the peculiar idiom of William Collins, and it is one of the merits of Mr. Ainsworth's book that he has defined this idiom perhaps more completely than have earlier critics. But valuable as this accomplishment is, it needs to be supplemented by criticism of another sort, in which, the idiom being taken for granted, attention is directed to those formal traits of content by virtue of which any one of Collins' poems differs from all the rest, and in terms of which reasons may be suggested for his success or failure in any given piece.

I note a few minor slips or omissions: page 225, the reviewer of *Oriental eclogues* in the *Monthly review* for June, 1757, was not Goldsmith but James Grainger (cf. B. C. Nangle, *The "Monthly review," first series, 1749-1789* [Oxford, 1934], p. 169); on the same page Mr. Ainsworth is in error in ascribing to Goldsmith the "Essays on the study of belles lettres" and *A poetical dictionary*; page 227, Brydges' ascription to Langhorne of the eulogy of Collins in the *Monthly review* for January, 1764, is confirmed by Griffiths' notation in his copy of the journal (see Nangle, p. 176); page 232, the first quotation from Johnson had already appeared in the *Poetical calendar* in 1763.—R. S. C.

Professor Archibald B. Shepperson's history of the burlesque novel in English (*The novel in motley* [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936]; pp. 301) traces the form from Fielding's burlesque, *Shamela*, to its decline in the nineteenth century subsequent to Thackeray. His discussion covers the burlesques upon the novel of sensibility, the Gothic novel, and the revolutionary novel of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. It is for this period that his book is most useful, and his quoted excerpts are sufficient to give the reader the quality and flavor of many forgotten works, a knowledge of which is helpful in tracing changes in literary fashions and in the temper of the age.

The discussion of the latter nineteenth century is less full and critically less weighty, but this inadequacy is considerably compensated for by a descriptive bibliography of the burlesque and parody-burlesque novels between 1830 and 1900. Professor Shepperson's conclusion that in the latter nineteenth century fictional burlesque became mere buffoonery and had no longer the critical value which dignified it at an earlier period is no doubt just in the main. Yet, as is subsequently demonstrated, critical parody and burlesque are by no means dead. Max Beerbohm's delightful *A Christmas garland* not only surpasses in humor and cleverness any similar work of a previous time but is, in

its implications, a work of first-rate critical importance, surely equal to or surpassing *Shamela* and Barrett's *The heroine*.—CARL GRABO.

French studies—or studies written in the French language—continue to appear in the field of German literature and thought, to carry on the tradition set so brilliantly by Spenlé's *Novalis*, Bréhier's *Schelling*, and Xavier Léon's *Fichte*. Now comes a publication of the Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, by Alfred Schlagdenhauffen, *Frédéric Schlegel et son groupe: la doctrine de l'Athenaeum (1798-1800)* (1934), which maintains the high standards established by his predecessors in the field. Few literary periods, so short as the three years treated by the author, have been accorded such a thoroughgoing and elaborate investigation; the short life of the *Athenaeum* is given no less than 413 pages of discussion, and a thirteen-page index. After an introduction which deals with the historical and psychological foundations of the *Athenaeum*, the work falls into three parts, covering respectively the three periods of the journal, during its three years of existence, in Berlin, in Dresden, and in Jena. A careful and exhaustive study is made of the relations of the Schlegels with Kantian and post-Kantian thought, with the ideas of Tieck, Wackenroder, Novalis, Schleiermacher, and Goethe, and with such concepts as "intuitionism," "wit," "enthusiasm," "mysticism," "irony," "vitalism," "liberalism," "culture," and "myth." The short life of the *Athenaeum* permits the author to consider the most minute aspects of the work, and to bring the whole Weltanschauung of the romantics under investigation. Indeed, one of the faults of the author is a tendency to garrulity, to overelaboration, and to spinning out his conclusions until they become conjectures or speculations. The aim of the work is to arrive at the doctrine or principles of the *Athenaeum*. "On trouve, à la base de l'*Athenaeum*," says Schlagdenhauffen, "un fichtéanisme esthétique fondé sur une conception toute fonctionnelle de la vie. La réalité, soumise à d'incessantes transformations, est considérée comme une activité pure, détachée de toute idée de causalité, où les événements se présentent sans trêve et sans retour. ... En invoquant le double parrainage de Fichte et de Goethe, l'*Athenaeum* prétend synthétiser deux manières de concevoir les choses: L'idéalisme philosophique et le réalisme poétique" (pp. 408-9). How the Schlegels attempted to reconcile these two approaches to reality—a reality which was for them *une activité pure*—not by the logical understanding but, by turns, through intuition, wit, irony, sympathy (*la sympathie universelle*), and their own "mythologie dont le symbolisme donne accès au *Centrum*" (p. 410), makes an absorbing account, and the author succeeds in illuminating both their contemporary struggle and the continuing significance of their thought to the present day, especially in relation to the aesthetic and philosophical implications of modern intuitionism as exemplified in Bergson.—CHARLES FREDERICK HARROLD.

Professor Thomas M. Raysor has followed his excellent edition of Coleridge's *Shakespearean criticism* (1930) with a substantial volume entitled *Coleridge's miscellaneous criticism* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936; pp. xvi+468). The materials which it contains are disposed in five sections, as follows: (1) the lectures of 1818, supplemented by a number of marginalia on the same subjects; (2) miscellaneous marginalia on English writers from the sixteenth to the early nineteenth centuries; (3) four reviews of Gothic romances contributed to the *Critical review* in 1794, 1797, and 1798; (4) conversations on literary subjects as reported by Henry Crabb Robinson, 1810-24; and (5) selections from *Table talk*. "The chief reasons for preparing this volume," Mr. Raysor tells us, "are the need of collecting in Coleridge's works various unpublished manuscripts and some important critical notes now to be found only in books of other authors or in old periodicals; the need of correcting from manuscripts many materials printed in *Literary Remains* [1836] in a very incorrect form; and the need of adding some editorial commentary to a body of criticism which has been influential in English literature." With respect to all these ends he has shown the same thoroughness in research and the same care and good judgment in the editorial treatment of texts as distinguished his earlier *Shakespearean criticism*. There doubtless remain a certain number of interesting critical marginalia which have escaped him; it is, for instance, unfortunate that he could not have known of the recently discovered annotations on the prose style of Jeremy Collier which Mr. Ifor Evans has described in the *Times literary supplement* for May 29, 1937. But he has materially enlarged the canon of Coleridge's practical criticism; he has given us for the first time satisfactory texts of many of the materials already in print; and he has greatly increased the utility of his collection by providing an adequate number of brief but pertinent notes. Coleridge, even in his informal moments, is so great a critic that what Mr. Raysor has done for him must be reckoned as a major service to English letters.—R. S. C.

The success of Ernest Weekley's volumes and the abundance of publications on English spoken in America give evidence of a growing interest in the study of words. The most recent work in this field—A. H. Holt's *Phrase origins* (New York: Crowell, 1936; pp. viii+328)—does not measure up to the standard set by its predecessors. Its aims are vague, and its execution is unsatisfactory. Many articles have no discernible relation to the title; e.g., PPC (p. 265) has no connection with an English phrase. Flippancy, insufficient or inaccurate information (e.g., the value of π , p. 298), inapposite allusions to physiology and especially to sex, and a display of unnecessary erudition (e.g., *adder*, p. 1; *banshee*, p. 16) lessen the value of this book. The remarks on "Wer nicht liebt Wein, Weib und Gesang,/Der bleibt ein Narr sein Lebelang" (p. 322) are scarcely sound, but contain a useful reference to Thackeray's knowledge of the English version. On *hocuspocus* (p. 167) see A. Wesselski,

Hokuspokus oder geborner Narr ist unheilbar (presented to the Gesellschaft der Bibliophilen [Prague, 1926]). On *rhyme nor reason* (p. 274) see J. W. Rankin, "Rime and reason," *PMLA*, XLIV (1929), 997-1004.—A. T.

Altogether the most interesting book which has fallen into my hands for some time is a brief survey of legal folklore. Since the legal profession in America has handed over this subject and historical studies in legal history of the older periods to the students in the humanities, mention of this survey is appropriately made here. Eberhard Freiherr von Künssberg's *Rechtliche Volkskunde* ("Volk," Vol. III [Halle: Niemeyer, 1936]; pp. 194, with 19 pages of plates) and the supplement containing texts, *Lesestücke zur rechtlichen Volkskunde* ("Volk, Ergänzungsreihe," Vol. I; pp. 80) review admirably the traditional aspects of law. No similar brief and comprehensive work exists in English. Although the references are naturally limited chiefly to German sources, von Künssberg—an authority in the history of German law—is familiar with pertinent materials in English, French, Norwegian, and Polish. Detailed criticism of so general a work as this would lead us too far, and I shall not go beyond this brief commendation and the suggestion of problems. Investigation in English sources might concern itself with the origin and history of brocards—traditional maxims summarizing the law, e.g., "*Qui facit per alium, facit per se*"—to which von Künssberg calls attention only in passing. (On brocards see my *Proverb*, pp. 86-97, esp. pp. 94-96; H. Lévy-Ullmann, *The English legal tradition* [London, 1935], pp. 365-66; T. Branch, *Principia legis et aequitatis; being an alphabetical collection of maxims . . .*, and the *Latin maxims and rules translated by John Richardson*⁵ [London, 1824], etc.) Less difficult in some ways and perhaps more generally interesting would be an examination of the legal antiquities in the English and Scottish popular ballad. And, as a last example, consider a detail of legal history about which we are little informed: the setting or answering of riddles in connection with trials and punishments. In sum, there are problems of all kinds in this field and workers are few.—A. T.

ANAG
ra
co
ra
za
BEH
Ste
lis
hus
A.
BOTKI
An
lect
(U
col
BRENT
men
Fra
avee
telle
pulp
Vol
Uni
Pp.
BUCHN
trib
tech
("J
mar
Vol
Hop
Bulle
Cata
d'es
Vol.
1936
COLUM
tion
Edw
Acad
Cam
emy
293.
DARGA
Fran
Torc
1937
The dis
alter
Latin
Engl

BOOKS RECEIVED

- ANAGNINE, EUGENIO. *G. Pico della Mirandola: sincretismo religioso-filosofico 1463-1494*. ("Biblioteca di cultura moderna," No. 304.) Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1937. Pp. vii+277.
- BEHRMANN, FRIEDRICH. *Laurence Sterne und sein Einfluss auf die englische Prosa des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*. Lachen: Buchdruckerei A. Kessler, 1936. Pp. ix+141.
- BOTKIN, BENJAMIN ALBERT. *The American play-party song, with a collection of Oklahoma texts and tunes*. (University of Nebraska diss.) Lincoln, Neb., 1937. Pp. ix+400.
- BRENNER, CLARENCE D. *Le Développement du proverbe dramatique en France et sa vogue au XVIII^e siècle; avec un proverbe inédit de Carmonelle*. ("University of California publications in modern philology," Vol. XX, No. 1.) Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1937. Pp. 56.
- BUCHNER, MARGARET LOUISE. *A contribution to the study of the descriptive technique of Jean-Jacques Rousseau*. ("Johns Hopkins studies in Romance literatures and languages," Vol. XXX.) Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. Pp. 184.
- Butlletí de dialectologia Catalana: revista Catalana de lingüística*. ("Institut d'estudis Catalans," Segona època, Vol. XXIII [Any 1935].) Barcelona, 1936. Pp. 356.
- COLUMNIS, GUIDO DE. *Historia destructionis Troiae*. Edited by NATHANIEL EDWARD GRIFFIN. ("Mediaeval Academy of America," Pub. No. 26.) Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1936. Pp. xvii+293.
- DARGAN, EDWIN PRESTON. *Anatole France, 1844-1896*. New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. xxxiii+729.
- The discovery of a new world (mundus alter et idem)*. Written originally in Latin by JOSEPH HALL, ca. 1605; Englished by JOHN HEALEY, ca. 1609; edited by HUNTINGTON BROWN; with a foreword by RICHARD E. BYRD. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937. Pp. xxxv+230.
- DOBBIE, ELLIOTT VAN KIRK. *The manuscripts of Caedmon's "Hymn" and Bede's "Death song," with a critical text of the "Epistola Cuthberti de obitu Bedae"*. ("Columbia University studies in English and comparative literature," No. 128.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1937. Pp. ix+129.
- DOTTIN, PAUL. *Le Théâtre de W. Somerset Maugham*. Paris: Librairie Académique Perrin, 1937. Pp. 264.
- DOWNES, CARL S. *Robin Redbeard: being a fictional biography of Robert Greene*. London: Heath Cranton, Ltd., 1937. Pp. 290.
- FELLOWS, OTIS E. *French opinion of Molière (1800-1850)*. ("Brown University studies," Vol. III.) Providence, R.I.: Brown University, 1937. Pp. 141.
- Five French farces, 1655-1694?* A critical edition by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER assisted by members of his seminary, 1935-37. ("Johns Hopkins studies in Romance literatures and languages," Vol. XXIX.) Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937. Pp. 141.
- FRAUCHIGER, SENTA. *Der englische Modernismus in seinen neuzeitlichen Auswirkungen nach den Werken von Dean Inge*. ("Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten [Swiss studies in English]," Band V.) Zurich und Leipzig: Max Niehans Verlag, [1937]. Pp. 120.
- FROHOCK, WILBUR MERRILL. *Pierre Lasserre: the evolution of his critical doctrines*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Edwards Bros., Inc., 1937. Pp. vi+105+xv.
- GIANTURCO, ELIO. *Joseph de Maistre and Giambattista Vico (Italian roots of De Maistre's political culture)*. (Columbia diss.) New York: Co.

- Iumbia University Press, 1937. Pp. ix+240.
- GIESE, WILHELM. *Nordost-Cádiz: ein kulturwissenschaftlicher Beitrag zur Erforschung Andalusiens*. ("Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie," Heft 89.) Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1937. Pp. viii+254; with 28 plates.
- GLOGNER, GUNTHER. *Der mittelhochdeutsche Lucidarius: eine mittelalterliche Summa*. ("Forschungen zur deutschen Sprache und Dichtung," Heft 8.) Münster: Verlag der Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1937. Pp. viii+74.
- GRIERSON, SIR HERBERT J. C. *Milton and Wordsworth, poets and prophets: a study of their reactions to political events*. New York: Macmillan; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1937. Pp. x+185.
- HAZEN, ALLEN T. *Samuel Johnson's prefaces & dedications*. New Haven, N.J.: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1937. Pp. xxiii+257.
- HOARE, DOROTHY M. *The works of Morris and of Yeats in relation to early saga literature*. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1937. Pp. viii+179.
- HOWARTH, R. G. *Shakespeare's "Tempest"*. (A public lecture delivered for the Australian English Association, October 1, 1936.)
- Independence, convergence, and borrowing in institutions, thought, and art*. ("Harvard tercentenary publications.") Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937. Pp. x+272.
- JONES, DANIEL. *An English pronouncing dictionary*. 4th ed., revised and enlarged. New York: A. P. Dutton & Co., 1937. Pp. xxviii+495.
- JURETSCHKE, HANS. *Das Frankreichbild des modernen Spanien*. Bochum-Langendreer: Heinrich Poppinghaus, 1937. Pp. 159.
- Le Conte de Poitiers: roman du treizième siècle*. Edité avec introduction, notes et glossaire par V.-FREDERIC KOENIG. Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1937. Pp. xxiii+61.
- Le haut livre du Graal: Perlesvaus, Vol. II: Commentary and notes*. Edited by WILLIAM E. NITZE and COLLABORATORS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1937]. Pp. xii+398.
- Le Sermon en vers de la chastée as nains de Gautier de Coinci*. Publié d'après tous les manuscrits connus par TAUNO NURMELA. Helsinki 1937. Pp. 225.
- LYNN, CARO. *A college professor of the Renaissance: Lucio Marineo Sicula among the Spanish humanists*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press [1937]. Pp. ix+302.
- MERSAND, JOSEPH. *Chaucer's romance vocabulary*. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Corner Press, Inc., 1937. Pp. ix+173.
- MINOCCHI, SALVATORE. *Il Poema sacro guida storico-religiosa alla "Divina commedia"*. Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1937. Pp. 174.
- NECCO, GIOVANNI. *Realismo e idealismo nella letteratura tedesca moderna: caratteristiche e saggi da Goethe a Carossa*. ("Biblioteca di cultura moderna," No. 309.) Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1937. Pp. 258.
- NICOLINI, FAUSTO. *Peste e untori: nei "Promessi sposi" e nella realtà storica*. ("Biblioteca di cultura moderna," No. 305.) Bari: Laterza & Figli, 1937. Pp. 380.
- The Old Norwegian general law of Gulathing*. According to Codex Gl. k. 8. 1154 folio. Diplomatic edition, with linguistic-paleographic introduction and four facsimile pages. Edited by GEORGE T. FLOM. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1937. Pp. 204.
- RYLAND, HOBART. *The sources of the play "Cyrano de Bergerac"*. New York: Publications of the Institute of French Studies, 1937. Pp. x+169.
- SACRET, J. H. *The "DXV" problem and the "Veltro": an essay in Dante interpretation*. Reading, Eng.: Bradley & Son, 1937. Pp. 32.
- SCHIRMER, WALTER F. *Geschichte der englischen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart: Lieferungen 1, 2, und 3*. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1937.

ol
ee
oo
o
98
na
li
au
k

th
ul
hi
ss

nc
ne

ro
na
gli

ie
na
a
ara
za

na
ri
er
&

la
S
th
on
ed
ll.
37.

the
ew
ute
99.
nd
er-
&

ler
in-
gen
ie-

11. *Industries of the State*